DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 971 EC 150 025

AUTHOR	Nevin, Ann; And Others
TITLE	Implementing Individualized Education Programs: Analysis of the Role of the Regular Classroom Teacher. Final Report, December 15, 1980 to December 14, 1981.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Santa Barbara. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE	15 Dec 81
GRANT	42-3008-81-3293-7100
NOTE	209p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Elementary Education; *Individualized Education Programs; *Mainstreaming; Program Development; Program Implementation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A three phase study was conducted on the role of regular classroom teachers in implementing individualized education programs (IEPs) for mainstreamed special education students. IEPs in 20 elementary sites were reviewed in phase 1, 59 elementary teachers were surveyed in phase 2, and 16 of those surveyed participated in interviews in phase 3. Five major research issues were addressed in the study: role specification of the IEP document, characteristics of the IEP implementer, environmental characteristics, and child characteristics. Findings from the three data sources were highly consistent, suggesting that regular class teachers were basically uninvolved in the formal aspects of IEP development and implementation (they typically did not attend IEP meetings, did not receive a personal copy of the completed IEP, and rarely referred to one when they did have it). Teachers with more skills, training, and experience in special education, and those who had students from resource specialist programs, were likely to be more involved in the formal IEP process. Informal involvement in the process was noted through meetings with special education teachers. It was concluded that regular class teachers should be included in IEP meetings whenever possible, should be provided with a personal copy of the IEP, and should be given training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching, special education techniques, collaboration skills, available special education services, and relevant legislative requirements. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

0592

ED221971

seri **Special Education Research Institute**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IMPLEMENTING INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS: ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER

ANN NEVIN AND MELVYN I. SEMMEL

WITH

SCOTT MCCANN

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC | SP
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

DECEMBER 15, 1981

PREPARED UNDER GRANT NO. 42-3008-81-3293-7100 FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lalit M. Roy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 150025

Special Education Program
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
University of California, Santa Barbara

IMPLEMENTING INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS:
ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER

Ann Nevin and Melvyn I. Semmel

Co-Principal Investigators

with

Scott McCann

Post-Graduate Researcher

Prepared Under Grant No. 42-3008-81-3293-7100 from the
California State Department of Education
to
The Regents of the University of California
University of California, Santa Barbara
Graduate School of Education
Special Education Program

Final Report

December 15, 1981

Foreword

This research study was conducted pursuant to a grant from the California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, for the period December 15, 1980 to December 14, 1981. The findings and conclusions of the study are the sole responsibility of the investigators and do not imply the official position or endorsement of the California State Department of Education or the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Special thanks are extended to Muriel Exner, Maurine Ballard-Campbell, Larry Schram, Richard Windmiller, and Dorothy Semmel for their facilitation of our research efforts. We also recognize with appreciation the following program specialists for their assistance during the data collection process: Aime Parenteau, Howard Wilson, Jack Lieberman, Clara Lockridge, Verna Yader and Rennett Faccioben. Becky Davis provided expert assistance as coder and Tim Kenney provided invaluable knowledge and expertise related to the statistical analyses. Jovita Huerta and Janet Franz deserve particular recognition for their untiring and excellent preparation of this manuscript. Special thanks go to Cathy Desio for her efforts in the final phase of report preparation. These people have made it possible to demonstrate a model for collaborative efforts between the University of California, Santa Barbara and the Santa Barbara County Special Education Services Region.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of the regular classroom teacher in implementing individualized education programs (IEPs) for special education students placed in regular classrooms. The study was conducted in three phases: a student IEP records review, a teacher survey and teacher interview. Convergent validity of the results was examined by triangulating the data from three sources.

The student IEP review phase followed procedures of a regularly scheduled triennial review of programs. One hundred IEPs were randomly selected from the elementary school sites of a special education service region in its fifth year of implementing the California Master Plan for Special Education. This enabled drawing an unbiased sample from rural and urban schools, from primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6) grades, and from less restrictive placements (resource specialist programs) and more restrictive placements (special classes for the learning handicapped, communicatively handicapped, and severely handicapped.) For each IEP, information was collected regarding regular class teacher involvement in referral, planning, reviewing and implementing IEPs; extent of participation in and modification of regular programs; provisions for

physical education; goals and objectives; placement changes and review actions; service coordination; and distribution of IEP copies.

The second phase of the study involved a comprehensive written survey of 53 regular classroom teachers identified in the IEPs reviewed as having one or more special education students in their classrooms. The survey included demographic data such as class size, number of students with IEPs, and experience and skill level related to special education competencies required for California certification as an elementary teacher, as well as data on the frequency and nature of interactions with support service personnel; work effort; satisfaction with progress of special education students; frequency and nature of activities with special education students; and frequency and satisfaction with time spent in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching activities and inservice training events.

The third phase of the study involved personal interviews with a subsample of 16 survey respondents to measure the reliability and validity of written survey responses, and to obtain additional information on the teachers' activities in implementing IEPs. Interviews also surfaced perceived barriers to effective services and recommended changes.

The findings from these three data sources were

highly consistent. The results indicated that regular classroom teachers were basically uninvolved in the formal aspects of IEP development and implementation. That is, regular teachers with special education students typically did not attend IEP planning or review meetings, did not receive a personal copy of the completed IEP, and rarely referred to IEPs when they had access to a copy. However, teachers who possessed a copy of the IEP were more likely to refer to the document than teachers who merely had access to a copy. Further, teachers who attended IEP meetings were more likely to refer to the document. Greater involvement in the formal IEP process was more common among teachers with more skills, training, and experience in special education and those who had students from resource specialist programs.

Regular teachers were highly involved in many informal aspects of IEP implementation, however. Most of the teachers surveyed implemented a variety of modifications of the regular education program to meet the needs of the exceptional students in their classrooms. An important finding was that relatively few of these modifications were included in the IEPs of the students for whom they were being implemented. This is in direct contradiction to current legislative requirements that all such modifications be listed in

the IEP. Regular teachers met frequently with special education teachers to discuss their special students' needs, programs and progress. These informal meetings were cited as extremely important for the development and coordination of effective educational practices for mainstreamed handicapped students. Further, the purposes for which teachers referred to IEPs primarily related to discussing the programs with special educators and monitoring and evaluating student progress.

An unexpected finding of this study was that a significant proportion of regular teachers periodically sent non-handicapped students to special education classes for various purposes including diagnosis and testing, instruction, participation in non-academic activities, and tutoring of special education students. Given the potential implications of this finding and lack of knowledge regarding the pervasiveness of such activities this practice warrants further investigation.

The implications of the results for the management, supervision, and training of regular educators and for special education policy were considered. Wherever possible, regular teachers should be included in IEP meetings. Further, informal meetings between special and regular educators should be arranged or facilitated by administrators. Regular teachers should be provided with a personal copy of the IEP for each handicapped child placed in their classrooms. Administrators should ensure that teachers are given sufficient time for educational planning and attending planning meetings, and that teachers maximize their use of non-instructional time. Regular teachers need training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills, special education techniques, collaboration skills, available special education services and relevant legislative requirements. Consultation with and observation of special education teachers is the preferred mode for providing such training.

State and federal special education policies should be revised to recognize and facilitate the role regular educators play in the education of handicapped students. To the extent that special education policies are revised to correspond to the actual practices of regular educators, they will facilitate the achievement of current policy goals within the realities of the regular classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword i

Executive Summary ii

Table of Contents vii

List of Tables x

List of Figures xi

Chapter I - Introduction 1

- Purpose of the Study 1
- Legislative Requirements Related to Implementation of the Individual Educational Program 4
  - Definition of IEP 4
  - Physical Education 5
  - Least Restrictive Environment 5
  - Extent of Participation in Regular Educational Program 6
  - Modifications of the Regular Education Program 6
  - Comprehensiveness of the IEP 7
  - Regular Teacher's Role in IEP Development and Implementation 7
  - Implementation Timeline and Accountability 7
- Review of the Literature 8
  - Role of Regular Class Teachers in IEP Development 10
  - Role of Regular Class Teachers in IEP Implementation 15
  - Document Characteristics 19
  - Implementer Characteristics 24
  - Environmental Characteristics 30
  - Child Characteristics 36
  - Summary 37
- Research Issues 38

Chapter II - Method 42

Description of the Setting 42

Subjects 44

Sample Selection 45

Data Collection Process 46

Sources of Data and Instrumentation 50

IEP Records 50

The Teacher Survey 53

Interview Protocol 56

Research Questions 58

Analysis of Data 58

Chapter III - Results 66

Student IEP Records Review Findings 66

Sample Description 66

Regular Teacher Involvement in the IEP Process 68

Extent of Participation in Regular Programs 70

Modifications of the Regular Program 73

Placement Changes, Service Provisions and Actions at Review 75

Goals and Objectives 77

Summary of Significant Relationships for Student IEP Records Review 79

Teacher Survey Findings 81

Sample Description 82

Knowledge of Law and Skill Level for Special Education Competencies 85

Prevalence and Awareness of Students with IEPs and Special Education 87

Integration Patterns 89

Use and Usefulness of the IEP 91

Work Effort, Support, and Satisfaction 95

Actual and Ideal Time Spent on Special Education Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activities 97

Inservice Activities and Usefulness 99

Consistency of The Teacher Survey 103

Summary of Significant Relationships for the Teacher Survey 104

Teacher Survey: Follow-up Interview Findings 108

Sample Description 109

Teacher Activities in Implementing IEPs 109

Effectiveness of Teachers 113

Barriers and Problems 114

Satisfaction 116

Recommendations for Change 118

Summary of Results: A Vignette 120

Chapter IV - Discussion and Implications 130

Limitations of the Findings 134

Implications 137

Management and Supervision Implications 137

Training Implications 141

Research Implications 145

Policy Implications 148

References 156

Appendices 161

1. Instruments 161

2. Supplementary Tables 180

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1.1 Summary of Major Findings from Literature Review Regarding Regular Class Teacher's Role in Implementing IEPs 41

2.1 Distribution of Elementary IEPs Reviewed for this Study 47

2.2 Distribution of Elementary Teachers Surveyed 47

2.3 Research Questions 59

2.4 Summary of Variables for which Chi Square Analyses were Conducted on Selected Teacher Survey Items and Student Record Review Items 65

3.1 Regular Teacher Involvement in IEP Process 70

3.2 Areas of Participation of Handicapped Students in Regular Programs 73

3.3 Types of Goals and Objectives 79

3.4 Integration Patterns 91

3.5 Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Purposes for Referring to the IEP 94

3.6 Percentage of Respondents Engaging in Diagnostic Prescriptive Activities Related to Special Education 99

3.7 Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Frequency of Attendance and Usefulness of Inservice Events 102

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Data Collection Process in Analyzing Involvement of Regular Classroom Teachers in Implementing IEPs	49
2	Protocol for IEP Records Review	52
3	Conceptual Schema for Development of Teacher Survey	54
4	Interview Protocol	57
5	Significant Relationships For Student IEP Record Review Findings	81
6	Significant Relationships for Teacher Survey Findings	108

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of the regular elementary classroom teacher in implementing individualized education programs (IEPs) for special education students placed in regular classrooms. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) and the California Master Plan for Special Education (California Education Code, 56000) require the development of an IEP which describes education specially designed to meet the unique needs of handicapped students. Additionally, these laws mandate that to the maximum extent possible, students with special needs should be educated with their non-handicapped peers. In most public schools, non-handicapped peers are educated in the regular classroom. Thus, the role of the regular classroom teacher is a vital component of the successful implementation of IEPs for many students.

The use of the IEP document is a critical policy issue given the high degree of involvement, time, costs, and expertise involved in developing IEPs. The investigators were interested in determining how IEPs were utilized following the development process. This was of particular concern, considering some evidence that psychiatric reports were rarely read by ward personnel and psychological reports, if read by teachers, were typically filed away and infrequently referred to for instructional planning (e.g., Morse, Cutler, and Fink, 1964).

The IEP is intended to serve several purposes: 1) The IEP meeting may serve as a communication vehicle between parents and school personnel to enable them, as equal participants, to jointly decide upon what the child's needs are, what will be provided, and what the anticipated outcomes may be. 2) The IEP itself may serve as a focal point for resolving any differences between parents and the school. 3) The IEP may serve as a commitment, in writing, of resources necessary to enable a handicapped child to receive needed special education and related services. 4) The IEP may serve as a management tool to insure that each handicapped child is provided special education and related services appropriate to special learning needs. 5) The IEP may serve as a compliance or monitoring document to determine whether a handicapped child is actually receiving the free appropriate public education agreed to by parents and school personnel. 6) The IEP may serve as an evaluation device to determine the extent of a child's progress toward meeting projected outcomes (Congressional Federal Register, 1981). Because the study focused on the disposition and use of the IEP once it was developed, the findings were expected to identify the actual functions served by the IEP related to the education of exceptional children in the regular classroom.

The analytical scheme adopted by the research team for examining implementation of the IEP by the regular classroom teacher used the conceptual base of role theory. Deutsch and Kraus (1969) cite the work of Rommetveit (1955) and Thibaut and Kelly (1959) who suggested three aspects of role which were adapted for this study: 1) prescribed or mandated role; 2) subjective or perceived (idealized) role; and 3) actual enacted or observed role.

The prescribed role for the regular teacher is reflected in current state and federal special education legislation. Perceived and enacted roles of regular teachers in the IEP process have been examined in a variety of academic and government sponsored investigations. Accordingly, there follows 1) an analysis of federal and state laws and regulations related to individualized education programs and the regular classroom teacher (a specification of the mandated role); 2) a review of the literature related to regular classroom teachers and implementation of IEPs (a specification of the actual and idealized role); and 3) a discussion of the research issues generated by the literature review (a description of the variables associated with the observed or enacted role.)

Legislative Requirements Related to Implementation of the Individualized Educational Program

P.L. 94-142 and the California Master Plan mandate that all handicapped children are entitled to a free and appropriate public education. The individualized education program (IEP) is the primary means for ensuring provision of such an education.

Definition of IEP. The IEP is a written statement for a handicapped child developed in a meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child, and, whenever appropriate, the child, which includes a statement of the present levels of the educational performance of the child, a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, a statement of the specific services to be provided to the child, and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in the regular educational program, the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved (Congressional Federal Register 45, 121a. 340-9; Education Code 56341, 56345).

Physical Education. Specially designed, physical education services, if necessary, must be made available to every handicapped child receiving a free appropriate public education and that each handicapped child must be afforded an opportunity to participate in the regular physical education program (CFR 121a. 307). Where appropriate, adaptive physical education must be prescribed in the IEP (CFR 121a. 346). California legislation includes adaptive physical education under designated instructional services (E.C. 56363).

Least Restrictive Environment. A salient aspect of both federal and state legislation is the requirement for educating exceptional students in the "least restrictive environment." Within the context of an available continuum of program options, public schools are to ensure handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other facilities, are educated with nonhandicapped children to the maximum extent appropriate. Special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (CRF 121a 550). At the time of this study, the California legislation adds the stipulation that regular and special education staff plan a school climate that is receptive to individuals with special needs (CAC, Title 5, 3106 (b) (3) (4)). Individuals with exceptional needs must be provided the opportunity to participate with nonhandicapped children in nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities as well as academic activities (CFR 121a 553). The current California Education Code includes similar mainstreaming requirements (E.C. 56001 G).

Extent of Participation In Regular Educational Program. The IEP must indicate the extent to which the child will be educated in the regular educational program. One way of meeting this requirement (according to the Office of Special Education) is to indicate the percent of time the child will be spending in the regular education program with nonhandicapped students. Another way is to list the specific regular education classes the child will be attending. In a special note regarding integration of severely handicapped students, the IEP may include any noncurricular activities in which the child can participate with nonhandicapped students, such as lunch, assembly periods, club activities, and other special events (CFR 46, 1981).

Modifications of the Regular Education Program. If modifications, that is, supplementary aids and services of the regular education program are necessary to ensure the child's participation in that program, those modifications must be described in the child's IEP. For example, if a hearing impaired child required special seating arrangements in the regular classroom, this should be specified in the IEP. This applies to any regular education program in which the student may participate, including physical education, art, music, and vocational education (CFR, 1981).

Comprehensiveness of the IEP. In answer to questions regarding the comprehensiveness of the IEP, the Office of Special Education noted that the IEP is required to include only those matters concerning the provision of special education and related services and the extent to which the child can participate in regular education programs (CFR, 1981). The regulations define "special education" as specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, and "related services" as those which are necessary to assist the child to benefit from special education (CFR 121a. 14, 121a. 13, respectively).

Regular Teacher's Role in IEP Development and Implementation. When a handicapped child is enrolled in both regular and special education classes, the child's special education teacher should attend the IEP meeting. At the option of the educational agency or the parent, the child's regular teacher may also attend (CFR, 1981). The Office of Special Education suggests that if the regular teacher does not attend the meeting, the agency should either provide the regular teacher with a copy of the IEP or inform the regular teacher of its contents. Further, it is recommended that the special education teacher or other support personnel consult with and be a resource to the child's regular teacher (CFR, 1981).

Implementation Timeline and Accountability. Federal and State legislation specifically address the issue of individualized education program timelines and accountability. Once completed, the IEP should be implemented as soon as possible (CFR 121a. 342). The IEP is not intended to be a performance contract, which can be held against a teacher or agency if a handicapped child does not meet the IEP objectives. However, the special education and related services must be provided in accordance with the IEP (CFR 121a. 349; E.C. 56345). Further, under State law, the regular teacher(s), special education teacher(s), and other persons who provide special education or related services to the handicapped child, must be provided a copy of the IEP, prior to placement of the child (E.C. 56347).

Review of the Literature

In a study of the implementation of Massachusetts special education legislation (Chapter 766), Weatherley and Lipsky (1977) provide a context for analyzing the impact of state legislation on the actual day-to-day operational behavior of service providers. They suggest that public employees (or "street-level bureaucrats") are individuals who "have substantial discretion in the execution of their work...free to develop patterns of behavior which become the government program that is delivered to the public" (p. 172). Such public employees (i.e., regular and special education teachers and administrators) are "constrained" by legislation rather than "directed" in their actual work. Several studies suggest that the actual effects of educational policies differ significantly from the intended effects of the policies (Weatherley and Lipsky, 1977; Stearns, Greene, and David, 1979; Craig, Miller, Wujek, Machover, and Herschberger, 1980). These studies indicate that variance is introduced when policies, i.e., statements of action, are implemented, i.e., translated into real action. The lack of specificity of many education policies affords educators a substantial amount of discretion in implementing the policies. Glaser (1976) suggests that characteristics of the implementation environment, the implementing personnel, and the policy itself contribute to this variance.

The current study was intended to identify the patterns of behavior assimilated into the professional functioning of regular classroom teachers as they provide educational services to handicapped students within the constraints of state and federal laws. Accordingly, this literature review examines the involvement of the regular classroom teacher in IEP development and the implementation process. Factors affecting the implementation process are reviewed at length. These variables are discussed in terms of characteristics of the IEP document; IEP implementers, i.e., the regular teacher; the implementation environment; and the handicapped student. Although some of the studies which were reviewed focused primarily on the role of the special education teacher in the IEP process, the findings of these studies have critical implications for the current study in terms of identifying significant pheonomena, processes and relationships related to IEP implementation by any major service provider, including the regular class teacher.

Role of Regular Class Teacher In IEP Development. P.L. 94-142 mandates that a teacher be present at IEP meetings. However, to which teacher this refers is unclear. A recent policy clarification statement defined the "teacher" as "any teacher qualified to provide special education in the child's areas of disability, or the child's regular teacher, or the special education teacher" (Federal Register, 1981). This definition of the teacher gives local administrators a good deal of discretion as to which teacher should be involved in the IEP development process. Some administrators believe regular teachers should be included in the development process, while others feel they should not be involved (Craig, et al., 1980).

The role of the regular educator in IEP planning has received some attention in the special education literature (Fenton, Yoshida, Maxwell, and Kaufman, 1979; Vautour and Rucker, 1977; Crowell and Rucker, 1977; Blaschke, 1979; Marver and David, 1978; Alper, 1978; Goldstein, Strickland, Turnbull and Curry, 1980; Safer, Kaufman and Morrissey, 1979; Craig, Miller, Wujek and Herchberger, 1980).

In a nationwide examination of IEP meetings, Blaschke (1979) found that the regular teacher was usually not present. Alper (1978) found a similar pattern of low involvement in program planning for learning disabled students among regular class teachers in thirteen school districts in California. Approximately 18% were involved in IEP planning. Additional evidence was found by Pugach (1980) in a survey of thirty-three elementary teachers. Her results indicated that regular class teachers were not involved in the entire IEP planning process for learning disabled and behavior disordered students, and infrequently attended IEP meetings.

In an observational analysis of IEP conferences, Goldstein, _et al._, (1980) found that regular classroom teachers attended 43% of the IEP meetings observed, in contrast to 100% attendance rates for special education teachers. In a study of 150 IEP's in three states, Marver and David (1978) reported the role of the regular teacher in IEP development: "Rarely did the regular classroom teacher play a formal role in writing IEPs" (p. 25). Furthermore, teachers who were responsible for implementing IEP's but had not participated in developing the plans expressed considerable resentment.

Within the IEP meetings, some distinct patterns of participation were apparent. The IEP was developed primarily by the special education teacher (Blaschke, 1979). The regular education teacher rarely contributed to this process, although some administrators attempted to involve the regular teacher in the planning process (Safer, Kaufman, and Morrissey, 1979). Placement decisions were usually made by the school principal (Blaschke, 1979), although the special education teacher was sometimes involved in this decision (Craig, *et al.*, 1980). Fenton, *et al.*, (1979) studied 10 personnel roles, including regular elementary and secondary teachers, and their recognition of their responsibilities as assigned placement team members. Over 60% of the teams surveyed had less than a three-fourths majority of their members who recognized their team's responsibility to make specific decisions regarding placement of students in special education services. Administrators had the highest recognition of placement responsibilities with support personnel second highest. Instructional staff, including regular classroom teachers, had significantly lower recognition of their responsibilities as placement team members.

Crowell and Rucker (1977) studied the influence of regular educators in child study teams. They found that neither appointed nor peer-nominated team leaders were more influential than other team members. Furthermore, neither those team members with high training in special education nor those with high levels of experience in child study teams were more influential. However, those high in knowledge of placement options were influential. An unexpected finding was an apparent bias regarding regular educators on ad hoc child study teams: regular educators who were the most knowledgeable about child needs and services were not always permitted to be the most influential, whereas all special educators who were most knowledgeable were also most influential. A similarly low perception of influence was reported by

Gilliam and Coleman (1981) who found in a study of twenty-seven IEP meetings in three school districts in southeastern Michigan that regular classroom teachers were ranked fourth in importance prior to the IEP meeting, but were rated seventh in contributions and sixth in influence after the meeting.

Goldstein, _et_ _al._, (1980) found that regular class teachers who attended IEP meetings participated less than half as frequently as special education teachers, and were the recipients of 10% of the statements made by other team members compared to 17% for special education teachers. Interestingly, no significant differences were found between regular and special teachers' levels of satisfaction with the proceedings of the IEP conference. The authors concluded that special education teachers take primary responsibility for the development of IEPs.

Teacher involvement in the development process has been found to be a critical variable affecting IEP implementation (Safer, _et_ _al._, 1979; Stearns, Greene and David, 1980). Such involvement was found to promote several conditions, e.g., increased availability of IEPs, greater correspondence of educational goals to classroom and teacher characteristics, greater teacher familiarity with IEP contents, a more positive attitude toward utilization of the IEP, and increased communication with special education staff, which in turn facilitated IEP implementation (Safer, et al., 1979).

In summary, regular class teachers appear to have limited involvement and influence in the IEP planning process, although such involvement may be a critical factor affecting subsequent implementation.

Role of the Regular Class Teacher in IEP Implementation. P.L. 94-142 and the California Master Plan mandate that the educational provisions listed in the IEP be implemented as written. For the purposes of this review, implementation refers to the delivery of services or the pursuit of the educational goals (or objectives) listed in the IEP. While regular classroom teachers rarely assume primary responsibility for implementation of IEPs, a majority are responsible for implementing some part of the IEPs for the handicapped students placed in their classes (Alper, 1978; Marver and David, 1978; Blaschke, 1979; Danielson, Fenton, Morra, Morrissey, and Kennedy, 1979; Craig, et al., 1980; Stearns, et al., 1980; Pugach, 1980; Zinck, 1980).

A national survey of IEP implementation indicated that 68% of special education students were enrolled in regular classes (Danielson, et al., 1979). Given that approximately four million children received special education services in 1979 (Danielson, et al., 1979), regular classroom teachers may have been responsible for implementing some part of the IEPs for 2.7 million handicapped students. Zinck (1980) found that 59% of regular teachers were responsible for implementing one or more IEPs in a study of IEP implementation in 173 schools in thirty-five California school districts. Alper (1978) found that 38% of regular class teachers were involved in implementing IEPs for learning disabled students in thirteen school districts in California.

However, the regular teacher's participation in the formal aspects of IEP implementation has generally been found to be minor. In a three state review of IEPs, Marver and David (1978) found that although most IEPs cited the amount of time to be spent in regular classes, few plans described goals or services to be provided in the regular class. This pattern was supported by the findings in a study of California schools in which Craig, _et al_., (1980) reported that 40% to 50% of regular elementary teachers (and 70% to 76% of regular secondary teachers) said they did not know whether their special education students were receiving the services outlined in the IEP.

A related phenomenon is the regular teacher's use of the IEP. Use of the document refers to a number of activities involving the IEP, ranging from translation of short-term objectives into instructional practices to review of the IEP for evaluating student progress or communicating with other teachers or parents (Safer, _et al._, 1979).

In general, regular education teachers appear to use the IEP as a guide to instruction less frequently than do special education teachers (Stearns, _et al._, 1979). However, approximately 70% of the regular education teachers who reported having IEPs available said they had used the IEP as a guide for instructing their special education students (Craig, _et al._, 1980). In contrast, others have found it "unusual" for regular teachers to use IEPs for instructional purposes

(Stearns, et al., 1979). Pugach (1980) found that regular class teachers seldom used IEPs during instruction for planning or monitoring students. However, teachers reported using the IEP for evaluation and conference purposes. Zinck (1980) reported that 6% of the regular teachers surveyed used the IEP to implement instruction twice per month; 29% said they used it once per quarter; 10% used it once per year; 0% said they never used it, and 50% indicated "not applicable". These findings indicated the regular teachers' perception of non-involvement in the IEP implementation process.

In summary, regular class teachers have not typically been formally involved in IEP implementation or use, but have actually assumed major responsibilities for implementing IEPs. Several factors have been identified in the literature which affect the regular teacher's role in implementing IEPs. Findings regarding these variables and their potential effects are reviewed below as they relate to characteristics of the IEP document; IEP implementers; the implementation environment; and the children served.

Document Characteristics. Aspects of the IEP which may affect implementation by the regular teacher include availability, content which specifies the service providers, extent of participation in the regular classroom and needed modifications, and goals and objectives, and the quality of the IEP.

The most fundamental variable which may relate to IEP implementation is the availability of the document to the intended service providers. IEP provisions may apply directly or indirectly to all of the education personnel serving the handicapped child. Thus, the availability of the IEP to the regular teacher is a prerequisite to conscious implementation of the specified services and objectives. Two forms of availability may be distinguished: 1) having a personal copy of the IEP, and 2) having access to a copy of the document.

Pugach (1980) reported that 12% of regular teachers with special education students had personal copies of the IEP on file in their classrooms. Furthermore, there was a positive correlation of .40 ($p < .05$) between having a copy of the IEP and degree of use of the document. Craig, *et al.*, (1980) found that of a sample of regular elementary teachers in California who had special education students in their classes for most or part of the day, less than 47% of the teachers in twenty of twenty-five areas said they had IEPs available for these students. The operational meaning of availability (e.g., possessing a personal copy or having access to a copy) is not known. In three areas, none of the regular elementary teachers reported having IEPs available. Furthermore, Stearns, et al., (1979) found that when a child has more than one teacher, the regular teacher usually does not have a copy of the IEP but the special education teacher does.

The second set of document characteristics which may affect the implementation process relates to the contents of the IEP. Implementation may be more likely if the IEP includes statements which identify the person(s) responsible for implementing the program (Walker, 1978). Similarly, specification of the extent of participation in the regular program, needed modifications of the regular program, and goals and objectives related to regular class participation might enhance IEP implementation by the regular teacher.

Marver and David (1978) found that although many IEPs included statements of the extent of participation in the regular classroom, few contained statements about services or goals to be provided in the regular classroom. This trend is supported by Dickson and Costa's (1981) finding that only 5% of the IEPs reviewed for their study included objectives for regular class participation, while 20% specified the extent of participation in the regular program. Specification of the extent of participation was significantly related to program type, with IEPs for children placed in less restrictive resource programs much more likely to include statements regarding extent of participation in the regular class than those for children placed in self-contained special classes.

Curriculum areas for inclusion in the regular program, annual goals, and short-term objectives may affect implementation activities as well. Dickson and Costa (1981) reported that annual goals and short-term objectives most frequently addressed the areas of reading, math, motor skills, and emotional behavior. Futhermore, a significant relationship was found between the type of program and the goals (and objectives). Goals and objectives in these four areas were much more common for children placed in self-contained special classes than for students who received resource services but were placed primarily in the regular classroom. Stearns, et al., (1980) found that handicapped students were most frequently integrated with non-handicapped students in the areas of art, music, and physical education. These findings may reflect an informal distinction in curriculum and goals between regular and special education classes, with non-academic subjects being emphasized in the former, and academic areas comprising the major focus of the latter.

Another aspect of IEP content which may affect implementation is the correspondence between IEP provisions and child needs and classroom conditions. Stearns, et al., (1979) found that the correspondence of IEP service provisions and goals to the characteristics and needs of the handicapped child influenced teachers' utilization of the IEP. Many teachers reported that they could not apply the short-term objectives stated in the IEP meeting to their instructional activities because the objectives were not appropriate for working with the particular child in the classroom setting (Stearns, et al., 1979). Further, some teachers reported revising the IEP document rather than implementing procedures which they felt did not meet the needs of their handicapped students (Stearns, et al., 1979).

The quality of the IEP is a document characteristic which may affect implementation. Walker (1978) suggested that the quality of the short-term objectives is a critical factor in implementation; specifically, short-term objectives written in observable, behavioral terms may make it possible for the teacher to translate these educational objectives into instructional activities. Similarly, the comprehensiveness of the IEP may affect implementation. Some teachers reported developing the IEP in sufficient detail such that it provided a practical guide to instruction (Stearns, et al., 1979). Other teachers working with less elaborate IEPs found them of little use in instructional planning.

In summary, several aspects of the IEP document ranging from availability to comprehensiveness were discussed. Having a personal copy of the IEP was found to be related to its use. Goals and activities for the regular classroom, although rarely specified in the IEP, appear to focus primarily on non-academic subjects. Correspondence between IEP statements, child needs, and classroom characteristics appear to enhance the utility of the IEP, as does the comprehensivenss of the document.

Implementer Characteristics. The characteristics of service providers may be significant determinants of IEP implementation. Primary among these are the role perceptions, attitudes, orientation, skills and training of the implementers (Safer, et al., 1979; Semmel and Morgan, 1978). As indicated above, the teacher's conceptualization of his or her role in the IEP process is critical (Fenton, et al., 1979; Crowell and Rucker, 1977). Craig, et al., (1980) found extreme variation in teachers' understandings of their role in the implementation of IEPs. Teachers' perceptions of their role ranged from total involvement to complete detachment from the IEP process.

Semmel and Morgan (1978) found evidence which suggests that teachers' attitudes toward education of the handicapped and mainstreaming are significant factors in implementation. Teachers with favorable attitudes toward mainstreaming of handicapped students appeared more likely to utilize IEPs. Regular class teacher attitudes towards the IEP and towards integration generally improved during the second year of implementation of P.L. 94-142 (1978-1979) compared to moderately to strongly negative attitudes during year one of implementation (1977-78), (Blaschke, 1979).

Safer, _et_ _al_., (1979) found that IEP utilization corresponded to educators' orientations to teaching. Teachers who favored the diagnostic/prescriptive approach to education reported greater utilization of IEPs in the development of instructional tasks. Conversely, teachers whose philosophical approach was inconsistent with the diagnostic/prescriptive approach found IEPs of little use. Teachers' orientations appeared to be a function of the educational philosophy of the institutions in which they received their formal training.

Specific skills have been identified for educating handicapped children in the regular classroom. Redden and Blackhurst (1977) delineated specific competencies for regular elementary classroom teachers to effectively mainstream handicapped children. Discrete behaviors were obtained from teachers involved in the mainstreaming process. Results indicated the need for further research into the actual behaviors needed to implement effective programs and to generate a more complete and valid list of competencies. Blankenship and Lilly (1977) generated competencies reflecting role changes for both regular and special educators.

Semmel (1980) conducted an extensive analysis of the provisions of P.L. 94-142 and the underlying explicit and implicit assumptions about teacher behavior and competencies. These assumptions include:

> 1. Teachers possess or are capable of achieving competency in assessment of pupils' current level of educational functioning.
> 2. Teachers can participate in the selection of long and short-term objectives appropriate for a particular pupil.
> 3. Teachers can choose appropriate standards and methods for evaluating achievement of short-term objectives.
> 4. Teachers are able to actively participate in the multidisciplinary assessment, placement, and educational planning for a pupil.
>
> Implicit assumptions regarding teacher behavior and attitudes also include:
>
> 1. Teachers accept the validity of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to educational planning and have knowledge of

> the empirical basis of applied methods of this approach.
> 2. Teachers' attitudes toward individualization and mainstreaming are positive.
> 3. Teachers possess or are able to gain competency in integrating IEP plans with plans for an entire class (p. 4).

Similar explicit and implicit assumptions may underlie role expectations for the regular classroom teacher in the implementation phase. Regular class teachers can apparently learn to implement programs as effectively as special educators as defined by improved special students' progress. Hasazi (1975) and Knight, Meyers, Hasazi, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin (1981) described a consultant who successfully trained regular education personnel to provide special education within the regular classroom. Miller and Sabatino (1978) compared and contrasted the effects of a resource teacher and a consultant model. In the resource teacher model, instructional services were directly provided to special needs children. In the consultant teacher model, training and consulting services were provided to enable the teacher to provide direct instruction to special needs children. Both models were equally effective in improving child related variables. The main differences between the two models were the increased instructional skills acquired by the regular classroom teacher as a result of interaction with a consultant.

The teacher's knowledge of the services available in the immediate environment, i.e., the school site, may affect IEP implementation (Safer, et al., 1979). Given the range of special education services available at some schools, e.g. curriculum materials, aides, the regular teacher's utilization of these supportive services is likely to vary depending on his/her awareness of their availability.

Training and experience in special education may affect IEP implementation. Safer, et al., (1979) found a significant correlation between the curriculum of teacher education programs and the utilization patterns of the graduates. Teachers trained in diagnostic/prescriptive skills tended to use IEPs more than teachers trained in programs which focused on other skills. In a study of the effectiveness of the IEP process in thirty-five California school districts, Zinck (1980) found that 16% of the regular teachers surveyed had excellent training in special education, 20% had good training, 51% fair training, and 13%

reported moderate training, although 59% were responsible for implementing one or more IEPs. Further, Blaschke (1979) cited teachers desire for more training in special education techniques.

Stearns, Greene and David (1980) examined the effects of P.L. 94-142 in twenty-two local education agencies in three states during the 1978-79 school year. "In general, the impact of P.L. 94-142 on schools was considerable... the immediate impact of the law on staff was that they had more to do and had to do the usual things differently " (p. 130). Regular class teachers in general reported they had not been prepared for the change in role required to include special education students and commonly expressed worries about time consumed in helping exceptional students, their own ignorance about how to instruct handicapped students, and the extra work required. Teachers who integrated handicapped students tended to have prior experience in teaching exceptional children or had taken special education courses.

In summary, teacher attitudes, role perceptions, orientation, skills, training and experience appear to be significant variables affecting the IEP implementation process. Positive attitudes, dynamic role perceptions, diagnostic-prescriptive orientation and teaching skills, and training and experience in special education are associated with IEP implementation and successful integration of handicapped children in the regular classroom.

Environmental Characteristics. Another set of factors which may affect the implementation process includes characteristics of the environment in which the IEP is implemented. As mentioned above, program type was found to relate to IEP implementation in terms of the extent of participation in the regular classroom (Dickson and Costa, 1981). Additional support for the effects of this variable was found by Stearns, *et al.*, (1979) who reported that regular teachers with students in resource programs were significantly more likely than regular teachers with students in special classes to refer to the IEP.

Local policies and procedures regarding the coordination of IEP implementation activities have emerged as a major factor in implementation (Safer, *et al.*, 1979; Stearns, *et al.*, 1979; Craig, *et al.*, 1980). Two administrative mechanisms have surfaced as facilitators of IEP implementation. One is the presence of a communication network among the various service delivery personnel. This may consist of a series of meetings between regular and special education teachers to discuss implementation problems and results (Safer, et al., 1979). The second process involves the designation of a role which functions as the implementation coordinator or "manager" (Safer, et al., 1979; Walker, 1978). The appointed individual has responsibility for coordinating and monitoring IEP services, assisting in implementing the IEP, providing technical assistance to the implementers, and acting as a liaison between the child study (or assessment) team and the service providers (Walker, 1978). In California Master Plan schools, the resource specialist at least partially fulfills this role. Both parents and regular teachers in Master Plan schools reported that the resource specialist played a crucial role in the coordination of special education services (Craig, et al., 1980). In contrast, Pugach (1980) found little coordination between instructional programs in regular and special education settings in a study of Illinois schools which did not have a coordinator role like the resource specialist.

IEP implementation may be affected by ongoing inservice training of service providers. Participation in inservice training programs related to IEPs appeared to promote subsequent utilization of IEPs (Danielson, et al., 1979). However, Safer, et al., (1979) have argued that some skills are better learned through practical experience as provided by participation in the IEP development process.

The availability of the services listed in the IEP obviously affects the ability to provide those services. Local educational agencies have a legal obligation to include all educational services deemed necessary to meet the learner's needs, regardless of availability. If unavailable services are included in the IEP, schools would have a difficult time implementing the IEP as written. Availability of educational services may depend on funds and community resources. These attributes relate to the size of the community, historical investment in educational services, and community values regarding education (Safer, et al., 1979). These propositions are supported by the finding that parents needed to provide more additional educational services in California's non-Master-Plan schools than in Master Plan areas (Stearns, et al., 1979). Further, school districts in rural areas reported providing fewer educational services than districts in urban and suburban areas (Danielson, et al., 1979). In a study of nineteen states, Helge (1981) found a number of problems in the implementation of comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Thus, geographic locale may be another environmental characteristic which affects IEP implementation.

Similarly, the amount and type of resources immediately available to the classroom teacher may be a significant factor affecting implementation. Resource supports such as assessment systems, curriculum guides, sequences of instructional objectives, instructional materials, standardized forms, classroom aides, and consultation personnel have been identified as critical to the provision of individualized education (Safer, et al., 1979). Assessment systems allowed teachers to conduct more comprehensive assessment of student functioning with greater ease and speed. Sequences of objectives in basic skill areas such as reading, math, and spelling were cited as extremely useful in translating goals into instructional activities. Curriculum guides and diverse types of instructional materials also facilitated individualized instruction. Standardized forms for instructional planning and record keeping promoted the development of tasks which corresponded to IEP objectives. Consultation with educational specialists provided teachers with assistance in interpretation and implementation of IEPs. Zinck (1980) found that regular education teachers were highly satisfied with the support provided by special educators. The presence of teacher aides allowed the regular teacher more time to develop and implement individualized instructional activities for their handicapped students (Safer, et al., 1979).

Time for instructional planning and individual instruction was identified as a critical factor in implementation according to several studies (Safer, et al., 1979; Stearns, et al., 1979; Craig, et al., 1980; Blaschke, 1979). The findings indicated that the more planning time available to teachers, the more likely IEP objectives were translated into individualized instructional activities. Planning and instruction time related to such classroom characteristics as class size and the number of students needing individual attention. Increased instructional time allowed teachers to provide individual instruction often needed by handicapped learners (Safer, et al., 1979).

There is some evidence which suggests that IEP implementation is affected by local documentation and monitoring procedures (Craig, et al., 1980; Stearns, et al., 1979). Teachers reported greater use of IEPs in areas where documentation and monitoring of educational services were required. The requirement for annual evaluation of IEPs included in P.L. 94-142 could have a similar effect on implementation practices. However, the absence of formal procedures for documentation and accountability for regular classroom teachers might limit the effectiveness of this contingency.

In summary, a variety of characteristics of the educational environment were found to be related to implementing IEPs including program type, coordination between regular and special education, inservice training and consultation opportunities, availability of special education and related services, geographic variables and planning and instructional time.

Child Characteristics. Another set of variables which have been found to affect implementation practices include the characteristics of the handicapped learner for whom the IEP is developed. Primary among these is the type of disability. Implementation patterns would be expected to vary depending on the severity of the child's disability, given the relationship between placement and handicapping condition (Dickson and Costa, 1981). Indeed, Stearns, et al., (1979) found that regular teachers with less severely handicapped students, i.e., those in less restrictive resource programs, were significantly more likely to refer to the IEP than teachers with more severely impaired students in special classes. However, the relationship between disability and placement makes it difficult to separate the individual effects of each in the implementation process.

The grade level of the child may affect use of the IEP. Jordan (1978) has identified significant differences in special education delivery patterns between elementary and secondary levels. Typically, fewer handicapped students are served in the upper grade levels. This might suggest higher rates of implementation given reduced time demands on teachers. However, Craig, et al., (1980) found lower rates of IEP use by teachers in secondary education. Clearly, the student's grade level affects the implementation process but the type and bases of the effects are unclear.

In summary, the severity of the handicap (in interaction with placement) and the grade level of the learner have been found to affect the regular class teachers' implementation of IEPs. Other characteristics of handicapped children such as age, race, and sex may be significant variables in IEP implementation. However, their effects on regular class teachers' implementation of the IEP have not been systematically addressed in the literature.

Summary. This review of the literature has examined the regular class teacher's role in the IEP process, with particular emphasis on the factors which may affect implementation activities.

In general, regular class teachers have had limited involvement and influence in the IEP development and in formal implementation of IEPs. They require particular competencies and skills to educate students with special needs in the regular classroom and regular class teachers have major implicit if not explicit responsibilities for implementing IEPs. Furthermore, a variety of factors including characteristics of the IEP, the regular teacher, the implementation environment and the handicapped student are important in examining the regular teacher's implementation of the IEP. While some conditions appear to promote implementation of IEPs, (e.g., involvement in the planning process, inservice training, communication networks, and linkage personnel) other factors may inhibit implementation activities (e.g., exclusion of the regular teachers from IEP planning, limited educational resources, fragmentation of implementation responsibilities and limited teacher planning time).

Research Issues

The review of the literature formed the basis for the present study and guided the development of the research questions. As shown in Table 1.1, the major findings from the review of the literature indicated that several characteristics and variables are correlated with the regular class teacher's role in implementing individualized educational programs. Moreover several researchers have reported similar results indicating that these variables should be addressed when conducting research in this field. These variables are summarized according to child characteristics, environmental characteristics, document characteristics, service provider (i.e., the regular class teacher) characteristics, and the degree of involvement of the regular teacher in the IEP process.

Specifically, child characteristics which appear to influence the regular teacher's implementation of IEPs include grade level and severity of handicap as it relates to the type of program in which the student is placed. Important environmental characteristics include geography or population (rural versus urban), availability of services, amount and type of resource support, time for instructional planning, and coordination of services. Significant document characteristics include the types of goals and objectives listed in the IEP as well as specification of the extent to which the student participates in the regular program. The crucial characteristics of the regular class teacher include the level of skill in applying diagnostic/prescriptive teaching activities as well as previous training and experience in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching. The attitude of the teacher and the teacher's communication with special educators are also important variables. Finally, the literature indicates several variables related to the regular class teacher's role in the formal process of developing, implementing, and monitoring the IEP, such as attending planning and review meetings, owning a copy of the IEP, using the IEP, and monitoring the IEP.

The results of the literature review provided the theoretical and empirical framework for generating six major variables which were used to assess potential relationships: type of program, grade level, population, special education skills, training, and experience. The identification of any existing relationships should form the basis for delineating recommendations for enhancing the regular teacher's implementation of IEPs.

TABLE 1.1

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM LITERATURE REVIEW RE REGULAR CLASS TEACHER'S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING IEPs

Major Findings	Researchers
Role of Regular Teacher:	
Planning	Marver and David (1978); Alper (1978); Fenton et al. (1979)
Implementation	Goldstein et al. (1980); Pugach (1980); Zinck (1980) Gilliam & Coleman (1981)
Use of IEP	Safer (1979); Alper (1978); Zinck (1980); Craig (1980); Pugach (1980)
Document Characteristics:	
Extent of participation in regular program	Marver and David (1978)
Type of goals and objectives	Dickson and Costa (1981); Stearns (1980); Walker (1978)
Correlation with having a personal copy of the IEP	Pugach (1980)
Implementer Characteristics:	
Correlation of diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills	Safer (1979); Redden and Blackhurst (1977); Blankenship and Lilly (1977)
Correlations with training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching	Safer (1979); Zinck (1980); Danielson (1979); Hasazi (1977) Miller and Sabatino (1978); Knight et al. (1981)
Correlation with experience in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching	Safer (1979); Miller and Sabatino (1978); Knight et al. (1981)
Correlation with communication between special education and general education teachers	Safer (1979); Blaschke (1979)
Correlation with favorable attitudes	Semmel and Morgan (1978); Blaschke (1979); Semmel (1980)
Environmental Characteristics:	
Correlation with population (rural v. urban)	Danielson (1979); Safer (1979); Helge (1981)
Availability of services	Safer (1979)
Amount and type of resource support	Safer (1979)
Time for instructional planning	Safer (1979); Stearns (1980); Craig (1980); Blaschke (1979)
Coordination of services	Craig (1980); Walker (1978); Safer (1979); Pugach (1980)
Child Characteristics:	
Correlation with type(s) of program/severity of handicap	Dickson and Costa (1981); Danielson (1979);
Correlation with grade level	Jordan (1978); Craig (1980)

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Description of the Setting

The Santa Barbara Special Education Services Region has been a Master Plan district since 1975. It is comprised of 95 school sites in 24 districts of Santa Barbara County. Special education services have been extensively reviewed at the local and state level. An analysis of the 1979-80 compliance review of IEP records was conducted by the special education service region as part of the regularly scheduled triannual review (Windmiller, 1980). An analysis of the 1981 program review was conducted by the California Department of Education, Office of Special Education as part of the regularly scheduled state review of programs (Miller, 1981).

Windmiller (1980) reported the 1979-80 Triennial Review of the Comprehensive Plan for Special Education Office of the Santa Barbara County Schools. From November 1979 to May 1980, 56 programs and 256 records were reviewed. This represented about one-third of the special education classes in the county. Of these 56 programs, 11 elementary resource specialist programs and 24 elementary special class programs were reviewed covering the following districts: Carpinteria, Goleta, Lompoc, Orcutt, Santa Barbara Elementary, Santa Maria Elementary, County Operated (north), and County Operated (south). Program compliance with legal timelines and procedures generated consistent data because every program and IEP record was reviewed by the same individual using the same instrument. Data were summarized according to compliance in 4 areas: referral, assessment, IEP planning, and review. Within these areas, there were specific items related to monitoring the participation of the regular classroom teacher. During 1979-1980, IEP planning and review meetings for students in resource programs were attended by 79% of the regular class teachers, whereas IEP planning and review meetings for students in special classes were attended by only 15% of the regular teachers. Participation in regular programs was noted for 100% of students in resource classes and 49% of students in special classes.

Miller (1981) reported the results of the Program Audit of the Santa Barbara County Special Education Service Region (SESR) conducted during March 2 - 6, 1981. Thirty-two school sites in 12 of the 24 school districts were surveyed. The participation of regular class teachers was selected for particular commendations.

In summary, these reviews indicate that regular education involvement in special education programs has been monitored and commended.

Subjects

A sample of IEPs for students at the elementary level were randomly selected from the 95 school sites (in 24 districts) of Santa Barbara County. This enabled an appropriate sample from rural and urban schools, where Casmalia district is the smallest (n=35) and Santa Barbara High School the largest (n=10, 635); of the 24 districts, 19 are K-6 or K-8. The total enrollment of all districts is 49,143. Of this number 5,347 (10.9% of the K-12 enrollment) are enrolled in some type of special education program and, presumably, have IEPs written for their program. The total number of certificated staff of all districts is 3,070 with

355 in the area of special education. The 1980-81 enrollment in the elementary special education program was 3,289 with 1,935 students receiving services from resource specialist and special class programs and 1,354 students receiving designated instructional services.

Sample Selection

The sample was selected according to the procedures developed by the Santa Barbara County Special Education Service Region as part of its triennial review programs. Each of 200 programs (district, building site, and type of program) was written on a 3 x 5 index card. The cards were shuffled and one third were selected at random for review during 1979-80. A similar selection system was used with the remaining programs to select the programs for review during 1980-81. A total of 49 elementary programs were reviewed across all districts for 1980-81, including 20 resource programs, seven programs for the severely handicapped, six for communicatively handicapped, two for physically handicapped and 24 for learning handicapped. The IEP research staff randomly selected 20 sites to review IEP records.

Once the program was selected, the reviewer obtained a class list from the teacher of the program. The reviewer selected five numbers from a list of random numbers and selected the corresponding name on the class list. To obtain the cumulative folder for that student, the reviewer followed confidentiality procedures in effect at each school.

For the purposes of this study a research staff member accompanied the program specialists who conducted the review of a random sample of 20 of the 49 elementary programs under review for 1980-81, yielding a random sample of 100 IEPs distributed as shown in Table 2.1. This represents approximately 40% of all elementary IEPs reviewed during 1980-81 (N=245) and 10% of all possible elementary IEPs (N=1,096) which comprise the pool of programs being reviewed.

For each IEP reviewed, regular classroom teachers were identified (N=59) and asked to complete a survey designed for purposes of this study. The distribution of teachers surveyed is shown in Table 2.2.

Data Collection Process

The sample selection process was consistent with the study design described in Figure 1 which depicts the four phases of the data collection process. The data collection system included the identification of regular class teachers who had students with IEPs assigned to their classes.

TABLE 2.1

Distribution of IEPs Reviewed for This Study

	Resource Specialist Class		Special Class	
North County (n=30)	K-3	4-6	K-3	4-6
Orcutt	4	1	3	2
Lompoc	0	0	2	3
Guadalupe	3	2	0	0
Santa Maria	3	2	2	3
South County (n=70)				
Santa Barbara	6	9	14	11
Goleta	2	3	0	5
Carpinteria	2	3	0	5
Montecito	3	2	0	0
Brandon	0	0	5	0
TOTALS (n=100)	23	22	26	29

TABLE 2.2

Distribution of Elementary Teachers Surveyed

	Resource Specialist		Special Class	
North County (n=24)	K-3	4-6	K-3	4-6
Orcutt	4	1	3	1
Lompoc	0	0	1	0
Santa Maria Ele.	3	2	2	2
Guadalupe	3	2	0	0
South County (n=35)				
S. B. Elem.	3	4	5	4
Goleta	3	2	0	3
Carpinteria	2	*	0	4
Montecito	2	3	0	0
Goleta				
TOTAL (n=59)	20	14	11	14

* Two teachers had students from both resource and special class programs.

This required a review of the IEP records which was coordinated with the regularly scheduled triennial review of programs conducted by the Santa Barbara Special Education Services Region. A random sample of K-6 IEPs was analyzed for content and extent to which regular classroom participation placement was recommended. Subsequently identified regular classroom teachers who were assigned students with IEPs were asked to complete a survey designed to elicit their awareness, attitudes, and actual involvement in implementing IEPs. A further subsample of the respondents was directly interviewed. Interviewees were asked to review their responses to the survey as well as to respond to a specially designed interview protocol. This surfaced further information regarding IEP implementation. It also provided a reliability check of respondents' written responses. Reliability was further assessed by directly matching respondents' indications of awareness and access to the IEP to the corresponding items in the IEP records review.

FIGURE I

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS IN ANALYZING INVOLVEMENT OF REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN IMPLEMENTING IEPs*

PHASE	SUBJECTS	DATA SETS
I	POOL OF K-6 FOR SANTA BARBARA COUNTY COMPLIANCE REVIEW (n=245)	1. CONTENT ANALYSIS
II	ANALYSIS OF RANDOM SAMPLE OF IEPs (n=100)	2. IDENTIFICATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS INC. REGULAR CLASS TEACHERS
III	SURVEY OF REGULAR CLASS TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO SAMPLED IEP STUDENTS (n=59)	3. AWARENESS OF CONTENT OF IEP
		4. ATTITUDES TOWARDS CONTENT OF IEP
		5. EXTENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODIFICATIONS
		6. EXTENT OF USE/ PARTICIPATION IN SUPPORT SERVICES
IV	RANDOM SAMPLE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS FOR DIRECT INTERVIEWS/OBSERVATIONS (n=16)	7. DIRECT OBSERVATION/VERIFICATION OF ITEMS 3-6
		8. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING VARIABLES IMPACTING IEP IMPLEMENTATION

*The data collection process for this IEP Research Project was coordinated with the regularly scheduled Triennial Compliance Review conducted by the Santa Barbara Special Education Services Region.

Sources of Data and Instrumentation

There were multiple sources of data for analyzing the regular class teacher implementation of IEPs. The review of the literature and analyses of federal and state legislation comprised one source. This information provided the basis for developing the instrumentation for the IEP records review, the teacher survey, and the interview protocol.

IEP Records. One data source was provided by the IEP records review. This provided data on the content of the IEPs as well as documentation of regular class teacher involvement in referral, planning, review and modification of the regular program. In addition, demographic data was also collected regarding type of program as well as availability of programs and services in the building. The instrumentation for Phase II (IEP Records Review) was based on a 24-item protocol designed by Windmiller (1980) to assess the degree of compliance in meeting referral, assessment, implementation and review aspects of the California Master Plan and P.L. 94-142. For 1981, a 15-item protocol was utilized. For purposes of this study, items were added to six key items already included in order to more clearly delineate the role of the regular class teacher. Figure 2 shows the 15 items noted for each of the 100 K-6 IEPs reviewed for this study. (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the Compliance Review Protocol.)

The validity of the IEP Records Review Protocol was addressed by two methods. An expert review of the protocol was conducted by the assistant director of the SESR, a program specialist and two professors of special education. This provided construct and content validity. A pilot test of the protocol was conducted with two program specialists reviewing a sample of IEPs not included in the study. The final protocol is shown in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2

PROTOCOL FOR IEP RECORDS REVIEW

1. Sex Male ___
Female ___

2. Spanish surname Yes___ No___

3. Regular Teacher Assigned Yes___ No___

4. Source of referral
Regular Teacher Yes___ No___
Other (Specify) Yes___ No___

5. Attendance of regular class teacher at IEP Meeting Yes___ No___

6. Status of IEP implementation

7. Extent to which student participation regular program
Academic Subjects
Nonacademic Subjects

8. Participation of regular class teacher at IEP Review Mtg. Yes___ No___

9. Modification of regular education program designed to enable a handicapped student to participate in the regular classroom Yes___ No___

10. Specification of such modifications in IEP Yes___ No___

11. Provision of Physical Education

Regular PE with nonhandicapped students Yes___ No___
Adaptive PE Yes___ No___
PE in separate class Yes___ No___

12. Level of placement last year/this year
From less restrictive to more restrictive
Same
From more restrictive to less restrictive

13. What actions were recommended as a result of the review?

14. Who has copies of IEP?

15. Who coordinates the services listed in the IEP?

The Teacher Survey. Another source of data was a written survey of regular class teachers. The survey was designed to: surface information on what regular class teachers believed their role ought to be (perceived role) contrasted with how they were actually functioning (enacted role) on special education diagnostic/prescriptive teaching functions; identify possible sources of variation, such as grade level (primary vs. intermediate) and organizational variables, such as type and availability of special services; and generate demographic data about personal and professional characteristics, such as years of experience, special education training, and certifications. The instrumentation for Phase III (Teacher Survey) was derived from the conceptual model shown in Figure 3. This was based on a comprehensive review of the literature on the implementation of IEPs, as well as an analysis of federal and state legislation and regulations and the Santa Barbara SESR procedural handbook (Schram and Windmiller, 1980). Items were generated for each area and Likert scales were constructed to enable respondents to indicate differential ratings.

The validity of the survey was addressed in three

Figure 3

CONCEPTUAL SCHEMA FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER SURVEY

AWARENESS LEVEL	ATTITUDES LEVEL	DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL	SUPPORT SERVICES LEVEL
1. Are there students with IEP's enrolled in your classroom (Part I, 8, 9.2, 11)* 2. If yes, do you have access to the IEP? (Part I, 12.1-5) If yes, have you read it? (Part I, 12.4) 3. If no, why not?	4. If yes, do you agree with the IEP? (Part I, 13, 14; 12.5) If no, why not?	5. If yes, to what extent have you designed specific instructional objectives for a student with an IEP? (Part II, 3) If no, why not? 6. To what extent have you changed your instructional procedures for a student with an IEP? (Part II, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18) 7. To what extent have you implemented a specialized testing or evaluation procedure for a student with an IEP? (Part II, 9, 12)	8. If yes, to what extent have you met with the parents of a student with IEP to discuss instructional programs or progress? (Part II, 10) If not, why not? 9. To what extent have you met with special educators to discuss the program or progress of students with IEP? (Part I, 15, 16; Part II, 4 5, 11) 10. To what extent have you participated in the planning process for a student with an IEP? (Part I, 15, 16; Part II 6, 10, 11, 16) 11. To what extent have you participated in a due process hearing for a student with an IEP? (Part II, 19) 12. To what extent have you trained or supervised peer tutors or paraprofessionals in their implementation of a program for a student with a IEP? (PartI, 10; Part II, 20) 13. To what extent have you participated in inservice training related to special education? (Part II. 4, 6, 8)

* Related Survey Items

ways. A draft of the survey was distributed for a pilot review by regular classroom teachers who completed the survey and noted the amount of time required and any ambiguities due to terminology, wording, or format. A personal interview was then scheduled to discuss reactions and to verify the relationship of survey items to their actual experiences in implementing IEPs. Teacher responses provided information about the content validity of the instrument. In addition, an expert review was conducted by two professors of special education, a program specialist and the assistant director of the SESR. They reviewed the survey instrument for content and construct validity. After careful examination, each person provided reactions and suggestions for revisions to the principal investigator. Revisions of the draft were made on the basis of the information collected from both the pilot review and expert review. See Appendix 1 for the final draft of the teacher survey. Finally, a third form of content validity was provided by analyzing the congruence of responses during the follow-up interviews with selected survey respondents.

Interview Protocol. The final source of data was provided by the interview shown in Figure 4. The protocol was developed to obtain teachers' descriptions of programs implemented for special education students as well as to clarify their written responses to the survey. The questions elicited teachers' reactions related to actual work effort, satisfaction, effectiveness, efficiency, problems and barriers, and recommendations for change. Interview responses were matched to written responses to determine reliability (consistency) of measurements of teacher behaviors related to implementing IEPs.

FIGURE 4

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What are your major activities as they relate to implementing IEPs?

2. How much freedom do you have in deciding what aspects/services you will provide for special education students?

3. Who/what factors determine what you do in implementing IEPs?

4. In what areas of your work with special education students do you see yourself as most effective? least effective?

5. If you feel you are less effective than you'd like to be, what are some of the problems or barriers you must deal with?

6. What are some of the problems you encounter in your work with special education students?

7. What do you do that is different from what others do?

8. How satisfied are you with your work? What are the most satisfying aspects? What are least satisfying?

9. What suggestions do you have for training regular education teachers who work with special education students?

10. What changes would you like to see in your work as a regular class teacher in implementing IEPs for special education students and how would such changes make a difference?

Research Questions

As indicated in the review of the literature, five major research issues were found to be associated with variables that appear to influence the regular teacher's implementation of IEPs. These issues included child characteristic, environmental characteristics, document characteristics, service provider characteristics, and formal role specification of the regular class teacher. The research suggested that specific variables were related to each of these characteristics. These variables were operationally defined in the data collection process to provide a source of data for analysis. Table 2.3 outlines each research issue, the relevant variables, data source, and research questions which were to be addressed using descriptive and correlational approaches.

Analysis of Data

Frequency distributions were generated to show percentages of respondents for each item of the teacher survey and student IEP records review. Responses to IEP records review items and teacher survey items were summarized and chi square tests of association were conducted.

Although the chi square analysis does not imply

TABLE 2.3

			RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
RESEARCH ISSUE	RELEVANT VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE	DESCRIPTIVE	CORRELATIONAL
Role Specification of Regular Class Teacher	Copies of the IEP	IEP Student Review Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents?	Are differences in the distribution correlated with population, grade level, program special education skill, training or experience?
	Modifications of the regular class	IEP Student Review Teacher Survey Teacher Interview	What are the types of modifications? Are modifications noted in the IEP?	Are differences in the distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education; skill, training or experience?
	Involvement in IEP planning	IEP Student Review Teacher Survey Teacher Interview	What is the frequency of teachers involved in IEP planning and review meetings?	Are differences in the distribution correlated with population, grade level, program special education skill, training or experience?
	Use of the IEP	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for a range of levels of use?	Are differences correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
	Refer to the IEP	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for a variety of purposes?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
	Knowledge that IEP students are in regular class	Teacher Survey Teacher Interview	What is the distribution of respondents who know that students with IEPs are enrolled in their classes?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skills, training or experience?
	Attitude toward IEP document	Teacher Survey Teacher Interview	What is the distribution of respondents who view the IEP as helpful?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education, skills, training or experience?
			What is the distribution of respondents who were satisfied with the progress of their students with IEPs?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?

TABLE 2.3 cont.

RESEARCH ISSUE	RELEVANT VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
			DESCRIPTIVE	CORRELATIONAL
Role Specification of Regular Class Teacher (cont.)	Placement changes and review actions	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of students who move from more to less, less to more, restrictive environments or who remain in the same placement?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
Document characteristics	Extent of participation in regular programs	IEP Student Review Teacher Survey	What percent of the IEPs listed participation in regular programs and for what academic and non-academic subjects including physical educational provisions?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, and for students whose teachers responded, special education skill, training or experience?
	Types of goals and objectives	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of students' goals and objectives?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, programs, special education skills, training or experience?
Implementer characteristics	Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for skills related to CTPL competencies?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Diagnostic/prescriptive training	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for training in CTPL competencies?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching activities	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for actual/ideal activities related to CTPL competencies?	Are differences correlated with teachers who participate in IEP planning & review meetings?
	Communication between special and regular educators	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for interactions with a variety of personnel?	
	Satisfaction with level and type of support	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for satisfaction with each person?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skills, training or experience?

TABLE 2.3 cont.

RESEARCH ISSUE	RELEVANT VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE	RESEARCH QUESTIONS DESCRIPTIVE	 CORRELATIONAL
Implementer characteristics (cont.)	Knowledge of special education services available in building	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for accuracy of knowledge?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
	Knowledge of special education laws	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents who know P.L. 94-142, California Master Plan, and 504?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
	Participation in special education inservice events	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents who have participated in special education inservice events?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
	Satisfaction with usefulness of inservice	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents on a 5 point satisfaction with usefulness scale	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program, special education skill, training or experience?
Environmental Characteristics	Rural v. Urban	IEP Student Review Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents according to North County (rural) v. South County (urban) for each item on the Student IEP Review Form and Teacher Survey?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Nature and amount of support	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents for each person and type of support?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Availability of services	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of respondents re accuracy of reporting available services?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Coordination of services	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of responses?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
		Teacher Survey	What is frequency of interaction with variety of special personnel?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?

TABLE 2.3 cont.

			RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
RESEARCH ISSUE	RELEVANT VARIABLES	DATA SOURCE	DESCRIPTIVE	CORRELATIONAL
Environmental Characteristics (cont.)	Time for instructional planning	Teacher Survey	What is the distribution of responses to activities related to planning?	Is there a relationship with selected variables?
Child Characteristics	Type and severity of handicap/ placement	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of students enrolled in less restrictive v. more restrictive programs?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Grade Level: Primary (K-3) and Intermediate (4-6)	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of students enrolled at each grade level?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Sex	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of male/female students	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?
	Ethnic origin	IEP Student Review	What is the distribution of students with Spanish surname?	Are differences in distribution correlated with population, grade level, program?

any direction or cause-effect relationship, it can indicate whether or not the variables are statistically independent. The following assumptions of the chi square test appear to have been met in this study: The observations (respondents' ratings on Likert scales and nominations for survey items) were independent; the status variables (grade level, geography, population, program type, skill level, special education training, and experience) were logical and mutually exclusive; expected frequencies greater than five occurred in cells for which tests of significance were obtained; and the sum of expected frequencies equaled the sum of observed frequencies.

In order to test the statistical independence of respondents' ratings and nominations, responses were grouped into mutually exclusive categories for variables as shown in Table 2.4 herein. Variables were defined as follows: (1) program type: least restrictive (resource specialist) or more restrictive (special classes for communicatively handicapped, learning handicapped, or severely handicapped students); (2) geography/population: northern/less populated regions and southern/more populated regions; (3) grade level:

primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6); (4) _skill level_ on 11 special education competencies required for California certification as an elementary teacher: low (sum less than or equal to 25); medium (sum between 26 and 38); or high (sum greater than 39 and less than or equal to 55); (5) _years of experience_ related to 11 special education competencies required for California certification as an elementary teacher; 5 or fewer and more than 5 competencies; (6) _special education training:_ low (those teachers who responded "yes" to receiving training in 5 or fewer special education competencies required for California certification as an elementary teacher) and high (those who responded "yes" to receiving training for 6 or more competencies). Although sex of the teacher might be an important variable, it should be noted that only seven respondents in the sample were male. Thus, it was not appropriate to include sex as a variable in this study. These variables (summarized in Table 2.4) were identified as status variables which might affect the teacher's implementation of individualized education programs.

TABLE 2.4

SUMMARY OF VARIABLES FOR WHICH CHI SQUARE ANALYSES WERE CONDUCTED ON SELECTED TEACHER SURVEY ITEMS AND STUDENT IEP RECORDS REVIEW ITEMS

VARIABLE	SCALE
PROGRAM TYPE	Less restrictive vs More restrictive
GEOGRAPHY/POPULATION	Less populated (northern) vs More populated (southern) areas
GRADE LEVEL	Primary (K-3) vs Intermediate (4-6)
SKILL LEVEL	Low, medium, high skill with 11 diagnostic/prescriptive competencies
EXPERIENCE	On-the-job experience with 5 or fewer diagnostic/ prescriptive competencies vs 6 or more competencies
TRAINING	Training in 5 or fewer competencies vs 6 or more

Responses to teacher survey items and student IEP records review items were individually recorded and stored for analysis using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) which generated the frequency distributions, chi square distributions and tests of significance (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, Blair, and Chilko, 1979).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results are presented in three sections: student IEP records review findings, teacher survey findings, and interview findings. Each section describes the frequency distributions for each item and those variables for which chi square analyses yielded contingency relationships at the .05 (or less) criterion. The findings are summarized in a fourth section, the summary vignette of a typical elementary teacher's role in implementing IEPs.

Student IEP Records Review Findings

The student IEP records review findings are reported in seven sections: sample description; regular class teacher involvement in the IEP process; extent of participation in regular programs; modifications of the regular program; placement changes, service provisions, and review actions; goals and objectives; and a summary of significant relationships.

Sample Description. The total number of student individualized education programs (IEPs) which were reviewed (N=100) comprised 40% of all IEPs reviewed at the elementary level (N=245) as part of the regularly scheduled triennial review process. Placement was equally distributed with 45% of the IEPs from resource specialist (less restrictive) placements and 55% from more restrictive placements in classes for the learning handicapped, communicatively handicapped and severely handicapped. The population variable was also evenly distributed with 30% of the IEPs from the less populated districts in North County and 70% from the more populated districts in South County. Grade levels were evenly represented, as well, with 49% of the IEPs from primary grades (K-3) and 51% from intermediate grades (4-6). Sex distribution reflected almost twice as many boys enrolled in special programs as girls: 68% of the IEPs were for male students and 32% for female. Students with Spanish surnames comprised 48% of the IEPs compared with 52% without Spanish surnames. Windmiller (1981) reported that 48% is high for this sample in comparison to the 25% enrollment rate of elementary students with Spanish surnames in Santa Barbara County special eduction programs, and the 25% - 30% of enrollment rate of student with Spanish surnames in regular school programs. However, this variable was not associated with grade level, geography, or program in which the student was enrolled.

The majority (94%) of IEPs were evaluated as being fully implemented. However, 6% were evaluated as having some component not implemented. The most frequently cited missing components were extent of participation in regular classroom, and speech and counseling services.

Regular Teacher Involvement in the IEP Process. As shown in Table 3.1, regular class teacher involvement in the IEP process ranged from low involvement in some aspects of the formal processes, e.g., having copies of the IEP and attendance at IEP meetings to high involvement in other aspects representing the informal process, e.g., modifying their regular program and referring students for special education.

A regular class teacher was assigned to 74% of the students with IEPs. Modifications of the regular program were reported for 61% of IEPs reviewed. The regular teacher was a source of referral for 45% of the students whose IEPs were reviewed. Regular teachers attended 34% of the IEP planning meetings, and 19%

of the review meetings. The regular teacher had a copy of the IEP for only 17% of the students whose IEP records were reviewed.

TABLE 3.1

REGULAR TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN IEP PROCESS

	Percent (N=100)
Student with IEP Assigned to a Regular Teacher*	74
Regular Teacher Modified Regular Program	61
Student with IEP Referred by a Regular Teacher	45
Regular Teacher Attended IEP Planning Meeting	34
Regular Teacher Attended IEP Review Meeting	19
Regular Teacher Had Copy of IEP	17

(*Note: Some teachers had more than one student whose IEPs were reviewed)

Chi square analyses were conducted to determine associations between regular class teacher assignment and program type, population (rural vs. urban), grade level, extent of participation in regular classrooms, and number and types of modifications of the regular program. Significant associations were found for type of modifications ($p < .01$); type of program ($p < .001$); population ($p<.05$) and extent of participation in regular programs ($p < .001$). Proportionately more regular teachers were assigned to special education students for whom process modifications of the regular program were designed; proportionately more regular teachers were assigned to special education students enrolled in resource specialists programs; proportionately more regular class teachers from more populated areas were assigned to special education students; proportionately fewer students participated in regular programs when regular class teachers were not assigned.

Only 8% of the IEPs had a regular class teacher who was assigned, identified as a source of referral,and attended the IEP planning and review meetings. Teachers who matched this high involvement profile were compared to teachers who did not. There was a significant association only with type of program ($p < .05$); proportionately more teachers who met the high involvement profile worked with students from resource specialist (less restrictive) programs.

Extent of Participation in Regular Programs. All

IEPs reviewed specified the extent to which the student participated in the regular program. Only 4% (n=100) of the students did not participate at all in regular programs; 45% participated in all regular activities except 30 or 60 minutes of each day for special education instruction; and 51% participated for specified academic and nonacademic activities. Areas of academic participation included art (58%), science and art (55%), social studies (51%), reading (50%), math (49%), and language (49%). Areas of non-academic participation included recess (81%), nutrition or lunch (77%), physical education (63%), music (57%), and bus rides (9%). Table 3.2 shows the rank order from highest to lowest of regular education activities for which special education students were included. A trend toward greater participation in nonacademic rather than academic activities is evident: participation in recess was cited in 81% of the IEPs and ranked first while participation in language and math were cited in 49% of the IEPs and ranked ninth.

TABLE 3.2

RANK ORDER (HIGHEST TO LOWEST)

AREAS OF PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN REGULAR PROGRAM

RANK	SUBJECT	PERCENT OF IEPS (n=100)
1	Recess	81
2	Nutrition (Lunch)	77
3	Physical Education	63
4	Art	58
5	Music	57
6	Science and Art	55
7	Social Studies	51
8	Reading	50
9	Math	49
	Language	49

IEPs with various levels of participation were compared and analyzed for differences associated with program type, geography/population, grade level, special education training, skill level, and on the job experience. A significant association was found for type of program ($p < .001$). Proportionately fewer students enrolled in special classes participated in regular class activities.

Data from the student IEP records review indicated that special education students were receiving physical education within a variety of contexts. The most frequent provision for physical education was with nonhandicapped students; 67% of the students with IEPs were receiving regular physical education with their nonhandicapped peers. Adaptive physical education was being provided for 17% of the special education students. Physical education was being provided for 20% of the students within a segregated special class. Some students received regular physical education and adaptive physical education or physical education as a segregated class and adaptive physical education. In addition, physical education was noted as a specified area for participation in regular programs for 63% of the IEPs reviewed.

Modifications of the Regular Program. A majority of IEP records (61%) indicated that regular class teachers were implementing a wide variety of modifications of the regular program. However, only 14% of these modifications were actually written into the IEP. Nineteen different types of modifications were identified. These were classified according to curriculum modifications (31%), process modifications (55%), or consequence modifications (9%) (see Appendix 2 for tables which detail modifications). Curriculum modifications included adapting assignments, assigning students to a lower grade, and implementation of a school wide curriculum. Process modifications included cross age tutoring, flashcard training, extra time to complete assignments, staying after school for help, precision teaching, cooperative learning groups, appropriate grouping/leveling in a curriculum sequence, and special educator team teaching with the regular educator. Consequence modifications included daily progress reports, or positive reinforcement systems such as tokens or points. The number of modifications varied widely as well: 51% of the teachers implemented between one and two modifications, 10% implemented between three and five, and 39% implemented none.

Chi square analyses indicated significant associations between type of modification and program type ($p < .001$) and geography/population ($p < .01$). More process modifictaions were reported for students with IEPs in resource specialist programs and more process modification were reported in less populated rural areas. A significant association was also found for program type and number of modification ($p < .001$). Fewer modifications of all types were reported for special education students in special classes. Fewer modifications of all types (process, consequence and curriculum) were reported for the urban areas with large populations. Proportionately more IEPs for students in special classes had no modifications while proportionately more IEPs for students in less restrictive environments included three to five modifications.

Placement Changes, Service Provisions, and Actions at Review. Student placements for the previous year (1979) were compared to placements for the current year (1980): 60% (n=100) remained the same; 2% were transferred to a less restrictive placement, while 38% moved to a more restrictive placement. These changes were analyzed for differences associated with program, geography/population, grade level, and special education skill level, training, and experience of the teacher. There was a significant association between teachers who had low training and a higher proportion of students placed in more restrictive environments ($p < .01$). A similar association was found for special education experience: proportionately more teachers with low experience in special education competencies were also teachers whose students had IEP placements in restrictive environments.

Possibly unavailable services were specified for 20% of the IEPs, such as extended school year (14%), adaptive physical education (5%), group counseling (8%), and additional screening or testing (6%). The likelihood of listing such services was associated with more restrictive placements ($p < .001$).

Services were coordinated predominately by the special education teacher (89%) whereas 7% specified no coordinator and 4% specified a district coordinator or supervisor. The distribution of copies of the IEP included 100% of the special teachers, 100% of the student's parents, 24% of Designated Instruction Services (DIS) personnel, 1% foster parent, 11% of the students received a copy, and 17% of the student's regular class teachers received a copy.

The IEPs were analyzed for actions recommended as a result of a review: 23% had not had a review, 37% specified no changes, 16% added services, 5% deleted services, 1% terminated services, 9% were recommended for more restrictive placements, 5% for less restrictive placements, and 4% were transferred to junior high school special education programs. Review actions were significantly correlated with program type ($p < .01$), and grade level ($p < .05$). Proportionately more students in resource specialist programs had not yet had a review, while students in special classes were more likely to receive recommedations for additional services. Proportionately more students in special classes were transferred to junior high school.

Goals and Objectives. Table 3.3 shows that the student IEPs reflected a wide range of goals and objectives with a wide range of frequencies. Reading was the most frequently cited goal (77%), followed by math (55%), oral language (44%), spelling (31%), comprehension (26%), and writing (26%). Less frequently cited goals and objectives included study habits (11%), self concept (10%), academic readiness (7%), self help (5%), cooperative behavior (4%). Motor coordination objectives were cited in 10% of the IEPs. Rarely cited goals included signing (2%), imitation (3%), and tactile stimulation (2%).

All IEPs reviewed included at least one goal. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of all IEPs specified three or more goals, with 26% naming four and five goals. This indicates a level of comprehensiveness.

TABLE 3.3

RANK ORDER OF MOST TO LEAST FREQUENTLY CITED TYPES OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Rank Order	Goal/Objective	Percent IEPs (n = 100)
1	Reading (decoding)	77
2	Math	55
3	Oral Language (syntax, expressive language articulation, phonics	53
4	Spelling (encoding, word analysis, grammar)	31
5	Comprehension	26
	Writing (written language)	26
6	Auditory Memory (perceptual skills)	19
7	Study Habits (On task behavior, independent work skills, following directions)	11
8	Self concept	10
9	Motor coordination, tactile stimulation (adaptive P.E., fine motor)	10
10	Academic readiness	7
11	Handwriting	6
12	Self help	5
	Basic competencies	5
13	Cooperative behavior	4
14	Imitation	3
15	Signing	2

Types of goals and objectives were found to have a significant association with program type ($p < .001$) and grade level ($p < .001$): there were proportionately more students enrolled in K-3 with goals and objectives in readiness and preacademic activities, and proportionately more students enrolled in special classes with preacademic and readiness goals and objectives.

Summary of Significant Relationships for the Student IEP Records Review. Figure 5 shows the significant chi square relationships for the students IEP records review. Placement in the less restrictive resource specialist program was found to be significantly associated with higher regular teacher involvement, more student participation in the regular program, and more varied types and number of modifications made in the regular classroom. Placement in more restrictive special class were significantly associated with higher likelihood of a) specifying possibly unavailable services; b) adding services as a result of the IEP review meeting; and c) greater likelihood that the IEP content included readiness and preacademic skills as goals and objectives.

FIGURE 5

SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS

FOR STUDENT IEP RECORD REVIEW FINDINGS

Variable	Item	X^2	Contingency Coefficient	p
Program Type	Regular Teacher Involvement	4.387	.281	.05
Less Restrictive/More Restrictive	Participation In Reg. Class	109.319	.712	.001
	Types of Modifications of Reg. Class Program	20.434	.364	.001
	Number of Modifications of Reg. Class Prog.	16.110	.373	.05
	Types of Unavailable Services	27.465	.441	.001
	Unavailable Services	16.162	.367	.001
	Actions at IEP Review	21.053	.421	.001
	Types of Goals and Objectives	224.424	.624	.001
Geography/Population (Rural/Urban)	Regular Teacher Involvement	5.702	.232	.05
	Types of Modifications	30.915	.439	.01
Grade Level (Primary/Intermediate)	Actions of IEP Review	15.152	.382	.05
	Types of Goals & Objectives	45.959	.340	.001

Population/geography was significantly associated with type of modifications implemented in the regular classroom. Process modifications were more likely in more populated areas.

One item showed a significant relationship ($p < .001$) with grade level (K-3 versus 4-6). Goals and objectives in readiness and preacademic areas were more likely to be associated with primary levels ($p < .001$).

Teacher Survey Findings

The teacher survey findings are presented in ten sections: sample description; knowledge of the law and special education training and skill level for eleven special education competencies required for California certication as a regular elementary teacher; prevalence and awareness of IEP students and special education services; integration patterns; use and usefulness of the IEP; work effort, support and satisfaction; actual and ideal time spent on special education diagnostic/prescriptive activities; inservice activities and usefulness; consistency of the findings; summary of variables for which chi square analyses yielded contingency relationships at the .05 criterion level.

Sample Description. As noted in the Student IEP Records Review Findings, regular class teachers were assigned to 74% of the students whose IEPs were reviewed. The majority of teachers had one student whose IEP was reviewed. However, three teachers had two students whose IEPs were reviewed and three teachers had three students whose IEPs were reviewed.

Surveys were returned by 53 regular class teachers, for an 89.8% response rate. The 53 respondents accounted for 61% of the students whose IEPs were reviewed. Respondents included seven male teachers, 46 female teachers; 21 from north county (less populated rural area) and 32 from south county (more populated urban area); 27 primary teachers (K-3), 24 intermediate teachers (4-6), and two teachers who taught a combined third and fourth grade. There were 33 students with IEPs from resource specialist classes, 28 students with IEPs from special classes for the learning handicapped or communicatively handicapped, and no students with IEPs from classes for the severely handicapped.

Teachers who attended IEP planning or review meetings were compared to teachers who did not attend IEP meetings. Significant relationships were found for program type ($p < .001$), grade level ($p < .05$), skill level ($p < .05$), training ($p < .05$), and referring to the IEP for discussion with the special education teacher ($p < .05$).

Because respondents were selected corresponding to students whose IEPs were reviewed, it was possible to compare IEPs of students whose teachers responded to the survey to IEPs of students whose teachers did not respond. Chi square analyses were conducted to identify associations with program type, geography/population, grade level, participation in regular program, and number and type of modifications of the regular program. Significant associations were found for program type ($p < .01$) and extent of participation in regular program ($p < .01$). There were proportionately more respondents whose students were receiving services in resource classes and participating more in the regular program .

For those students whose teachers responded to the survey, skill level of the regular teacher showed no significant contingency relationships with the dependent variables related to student IEP records. However, changes in IEP placement were significantly correlated with teachers who reported training in special education competencies as well as with teachers who used special education inservice events.

In general, the respondents were a group of mature professionals with substantial years of experience and tenure in the districts. Over 68% of the respondents (n=53) reported 11 or more years of teaching experience and 46% had held their positions for 11 or more years in the same district. Two teachers were retiring at the time of the survey after 30 years of service.

This maturity was further evidenced by their reported certifications and training. All teachers reported holding the basic elementary teaching credential; 21% reported special credentials; 13% held administrative credentials and 8% reported other authorizations such as Miller-Unruh certification. Only 26% of the respondents indicated they had completed or were enrolled in a masters degree program; 15% were completing other certification programs. None were enrolled in a doctoral program.

Teaching responsibilities for more than one classroom were cited by 34% of the respondents, with team teaching situations being cited by the majority. Most teachers (73%) indicated they encountered non-English or limited English speaking handicapped students (49% encounter them occasionally, 6% frequently, and 25% more or less daily). Further, 91% indicated that Spanish speaking children were most frequently encountered, yet only 17% of the teachers reported they spoke Spanish.

Knowledge of the Law and Skill Level for 11 Special Education Competencies. The respondents indicated some knowledge of special education legislation: 19% (n=51) reported they were knowledgeable of P.L. 94-142, 11% were knowledgeable of the 504 Regulations, and 58% were knowledgeable of the California Master Plan for special education. Chi square analyses yielded no significant associations between knowledge of the law and type of program, grade level, or skill level of respondents. However, this variable was significantly related to experience in special education competencies required for California certification as an elementary teacher ($p < .05$).

The Commission for Teacher Preparation and

Licensing requires that all graduates from basic multiple subjects credential programs must complete certain special education competencies: 45% of the respondents indicated they were aware of the competencies. Respondents also indicated whether they had received training or job-related experiences for each of the eleven competencies. In addition they rated the degree of skill they had attained for each competency on a Likert scale of 1 (corresponding to no degree of skill) to 5 (corresponding to very skilled). Percentages of those who reported formal training and experiences related to the special education competencies ranged from a low of 42% (n=48) for "analyzing non-discriminatory assessment" to a high of 96% for "recognizing differences and similarities of exceptional and nonexceptional students" (See Appendix 2 for detailed skill ratings for each competency.)

In general, respondents indicated a moderate degree of skill for the eleven competencies. The majority of those responding indicated they were very skilled at recognizing special education students' academic strengths and weaknesses (53% scored 4 and 5); recognizing differences and similarities of exceptional and nonexceptional students (61%); and promoting student growth in the affective domain and in interpersonal relations (59%). The weakest competency was understanding current special education legislation and concepts of least restrictive environment and due process (61% reported no skill or very little skill).

Respondents' skill ratings were summed and categorized according to three skill levels (low, medium and high) in relation to the range of summed scores (0 to 55). A low skill level (0-25) was obtained by 22% of the teachers; a medium skill level (26-38) was obtained by 56% of the teachers; and a high skill level (39-55) was obtained by 22% of the teacher. Chi square analyses yielded no significant associations between skill level and population, grade level, program type, special education training or experience.

Prevalence and Awareness of Students with IEP and Special Education Services. The class size of the respondents ranged from 22 students to 47 students with a mean of 30 (mean number of girls was 13 ranging from 7 to 18; mean number of boys was 16, ranging from 9 to 24). The mean number of girls with IEPs was one, ranging from zero to eight; the mean number of boys with IEPs was two, ranging from zero to six. The percentage of students with IEPs ranged from 0 to 33% with an average of 10%. Teachers indicated that from zero to ten with a mean of three special education students were assigned to their regular classrooms during the 1980-81 school year, including those who moved away or were transferred to other programs.

The teachers who indicated they had no students with IEPs but who were assigned at least one special education student comprised 17% of the respondents (n = 53). In essence these teachers did not know there were special education students in their classrooms, yet the teachers had been named in the IEP records review as responsible for implementing some aspect of the IEP. However, 83% accurately indicated that they had students with IEPs in their regular classrooms. Chi square analyses yielded significant associations between awareness of special education students in class and program type ($p < .001$) and skill level ($p < .05$). Proportionately more teachers with students in resource programs were aware of the special status of their students. Similarly, more teachers with high skill levels knew there were special education students in their regular classrooms.

Teachers were asked to identify the special education services available in their respective buildings (see Appendix 2 for the detailed table of their responses). Their responses were checked for accuracy of services actually available. Accuracy ranged from 44% to 87% with an average of 56%. Chi square analyses yielded no significant associations between accuracy and program, grade, population, or special education skill level, training or experience.

Integration Patterns. Teachers reported that from one to nine students from classes for the communicatively handicapped were included in regular classroom activities for math, reading, social studies, art, physical education and other activities such as field trips and from one to 14 such students were included for music class. From one to four students from classes for learning handicapped students were included in regular classroom activities for math,reading, social studies, art, physical education, and field trips, and from one to five such students were included in music class. No students from classes the severely handicapped were included in any regular class activities.

TABLE 3.4

INTEGRATION PATTERNS

(Expressed in Percent of Respondents, n=48)

	PROGRAM TYPE/SEVERITY OF HANDICAP			
	Resource Specialist	Learning Handicapped	Communicatively Handi capped	Severely Handicapped
"Mainstreaming" Regular Class Teacher receives students with IEP for instruction with students	100%	50%	17%	0%
"Reverse Mainstreaming" Regular Class Teacher sends nonhandicapped students to the special education class for participation in academic & nonacademic activities	41%	13%	5%	0%

As shown in Table 3.4, 41% (n=48) of the respondents indicated that they sent from one to nine nonhandicapped students to resource specialist classes; 13% sent from one to five regular education students in classes for the learning handicapped; 5% sent from one to nine nonhandicapped students to classes for the communicatively handicapped. No nonhandicapped students attended classes for the severely handicapped. From one to eight students attended the speech therapist class and from one to nine students attended the Miller Unruh teacher or migrant aide.

Nonhandicapped students participated in the special education classes for a variety of activities including reading, math, and language arts as well as nonacademic activities such as "Friday Fun" and field trips. Some nonhandicapped students attended the special class for testing, while a few assisted as tutors for the special students.

Use and Usefulness of the IEP. Twenty three percent (23%) of the respondents (n = 53) reported they had a copy of the IEPs for the special education students assigned to their classes. This is relatively consistent with the student IEP records review findings that 17% of the 100 IEPs were distributed to regular class teachers. For the teachers who did not have a copy, 47% reported they had access to a copy which was located with the resource room teacher; 39% had access to a copy with the special education teacher; 21% had access to a copy in the central office files; 21% with a speech therapist; 6% with a psychologist and 6% with other personnel. Only 11% did not know where to access a copy.

Frequency of use of or referral to the IEP was reported: 13% referred to it once or twice a year and 13% referred to it occasionally (1-2 days per month). However, 60% of the respondents (n = 53) indicated that they referred to the IEP for one to five purposes. As shown in Table 3.5, of those who reported they referred to the IEP, eight percent referred to the IEP to prepare daily lessons; 47% to review the student's progress; 41% to prepare a report of student progress for parent conferences; 45% to discuss the IEP with the special education teacher; 17% to supervise aides or tutors who work with the special student.

TABLE 3.5

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Purposes for Referring to IEP*

Rank	Purpose	Percent (n=53)
1	To review students progress	47
2	To discuss IEP with Special Educator	45
3	To prepare progress report for parent conference	41
4	To supervise aides or tutors working with the special student	17
5	To prepare daily lessons	8

Note: Teachers who had a copy of the IEP were more likely to refer to the IEP ($p < .05$)

Chi square analyses indicated a significant association ($p < .01$) between program type and referring to the IEP. Teachers with students in resource specialist programs were more likely to refer to the IEPs. Experience related to the special education competencies was significantly associated with teacher referral to the IEP ($p < .05$). Teachers with greater experience were more likely to refer to the document.

Respondents indicated to what extent the IEP was useful or helpful in carrying out responsibilities: 22% ($n = 45$) reported the IEP as not at all helpful; 31% reported it as somewhat helpful; 24% as fairly helpful; 8% as very helpful; and 13% as extremely helpful. Thus

78% of the respondents perceived the IEP to be helpful.

These data are supported by the respondents' level of familiarity with the content of the IEP: 34% (n = 51) reported that they were not familiar with the content while 66% reported some familiarity with the IEP. Only 24% indicated they would like to learn more about the content of IEPs. Furthermore, 60% of the respondents were satisfied with the current provisions of the goals and objectives of the IEP while 40% wished provisions to be more specific. Fifty-two percent (52%) were satisifed with the current provisions of the assessment information in an IEP, while 43% wanted such provisions to be more specific, and 5% less specific. Fifty percent (50%) thought support services should be the same while 45% wanted revisions to be more specific and 4% less specific. Similarly, 57% indicated evaluation procedures should be the same while 38% indicated revisions should be more specific and 5% less specific.

Chi square analyses were conducted to determine if relationships existed between usefulness (or helpfulness) of the IEP and program type, geography/population, grade level, and skill level. A significant association was found between usefulness/helpfulness of the IEP and skill level ($p <$

.05), having a copy of the IEP ($p < .05$), and referring to the document ($p < .001$). Proportionately more teachers with high skill level reported the IEP was usefl and helpful; proportionately more teachers who had a copy reported the IEP was useful; and proportionately more teachers who referred to the IEP reported it as useful.

Work Effort, Support, and Satisfaction. Over 69% of respondents ($n = 51$) reported working more than 40 hours per week, ranging from eight to ninety-nine hours, with an average of 46.5 hours per week. Respondents interacted with a variety of personnel regarding their special education students: 6% indicated interacting with no one; 49% interacted with at least one person; 18% with two; 13% with three. Teachers interacted with an average number of two people. Teachers interacted most frequently with special education teachers (90% interacted 1-2 days per week); teacher aides (84%); resource specialists (75%); other regular class teachers (65%); and special education aides (57%). The least frequent interactions were reported for special education administrators, principals/vice principals, program specialists, and Designated Instruction Services instructors.

The nature of support respondents received from the people with whom they interacted was also reported.

Respondents received different types of support from a variety of personnel at various frequencies. Program specialists were the most frequently cited by 43% of the respondents for providing special materials and ideas for special education students. Resource specialists were the most frequently cited by 55% of the respondents for providing direct instruction time with special education students. Resource specialists were cited the most frequently by 36% of the teachers for providing emotional support or stress reduction. Resource specialists were also most frequently cited by 36% of the respondents for providing training in special education techniques.

A measure of satisfaction with the support received was also obtained. Of those who reported their satisfaction, the highest degree of satisfaction was reported for the resource specialist, cited by 62%, and special class teacher, cited by 50%. A sum of satisfaction with support was calculated for each teacher. Teachers were then classified as low (0-15), medium (16-23), or high (24-36) levels of satisfaction. Specifically, 45% of the respondents were classified as low, 32% as medium, and 22% as high levels of satisfaction. A significant relationships was found between satisfaction levels and geography (population): teachers from more populated areas reported a higher level of satisfaction with support ($p < .001$).

Respondents indicated the extent to which they were satisfied with the progress of the special education students assigned to their respective classrooms. The results show that 18% were not at all satisfied; 58% were somewhat satisfied; 12% were fairly satisfied; 10% were very satisfied and 2% were extremely satisfied.

Actual and Ideal Time Spent On Special Education Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activities. Respondents rated 25 activities which were correlated with the following special education diagnostic/prescriptive functions: Referral, Assessment, Monitoring, Due Process, Supervision, Direct Teaching, Inservice Participation and Planning/Coordinating. Ratings addressed time actually spent engaging in the activity (never, rarely, occasionally, frequently, or daily) and the time teachers ideally would like to spend on the activities (less, more, or same amount of time). Frequency distributions showing respondents' rating for each diagnostic/prescriptive activity are given in Appendix 2. Table 3.6 shows the rank order from highest to lowest of percent of respondents who engaged in the specified diagnostic prescriptive activities related to each of eight functions.

TABLE 3.6

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) of Percent of Respondents (n=51) Engaging in Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activities Related to Special Education Functions

RANK	FUNCTION	PERCENTAGE
1	Monitor	94
2	Direct Instruction	84
3	Assessment	80
4	Planning/Coordinating	72
4	Referral	72
5	Supervise	66
6	Due Process	29
7	Inservice	21

The most frequently named activities focused on monitoring performance followed by direct teaching responsibilities such as implementing curriculum to promote positive interactions between nonhandicapped and handicapped students; providing one-to-one or small group instruction with special education students; employing special supplementary material or aids. The least frequently named activities focused on due process, supervision of peer tutors, inservice participation, and attending IEP planning, review or due process meetings.

Comparisons with ratings of ideal times indicated that most respondents were quite satisfied with the level of activity they reported for each diagnostic/prescriptive function. A majority felt they should spend more time observing special educators implement special education techniques to learn educational practices which help special education students.

Inservice Activities and Usefulness. Respondents indicated attendance at a range of inservice events. They rated the usefulness of the inservice event according to a Likert scale ranging from one (not useful at all) to five (extremely useful). The results show that 67% of respondents participated in at least one special education inservice event. As shown in Table 3.7, consultation from the special education teacher was cited by 62% of the respondents whereas 94% rated this activity as "somewhat to extremely" useful. Discussion with other regular class teachers who have special education students was the next most frequently cited event: 53% reported they received it and 64% perceived it to be "somewhat to extremely" useful. Visitation to exemplary programs was cited by 86% as most useful although only 9% reported they had engaged in this type of inservice event.

TABLE 3.7

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percent of Respondents (n=53) Who Reported Frequency of Attendance and Usefulness of Inservice Events

RANK ORDER		INSERVICE EVENT	PERCENT	
Frequency	Usefulness		Frequency	Usefulness
1	2	Consultation from Special Education Teacher	62	78
2	4	Discussion with Other Regular Class Teachers	53	64
3	4	Review of Literature or Article	41	64
4	5	Attendance at Professional Conference	20	50
5	5	Workshop	18	50
6	3	Observation of a Demonstrated Special Education Technique		66
7	5	University Extension Course	11	50
	6	Summer Special Education Course	11	28
8	1	Visitation to Exemplary Program	9	86

Respondents who indicated using at least one inservice event (67%) were compared to those who did not participate in inservice (33%). A significant chi square association was found for on-the-job experience and use of inservice events ($p < .05$): teachers with experience in more special education competencies were more likely to use special education inservice events.

A total of 22 written comments was provided by 35% of all survey respondents: 50% of the comments were positive comments included, "The program has been excellent at our school," "We have an excellent program," "The students in my classroom generally accept the handicapped student as a regular member of the classroom." Only 18% of the written comments were negative and matched some of the negative comments related to dissatisfaction with student progress provided by the interviewees: "Two of the three students I feel I helped and I reached them. One math student I feel I didn't reach at all." The other negative comments referred to the survey itself e.g., "This survey was a pain" or "Save your time, money and paper." However, 18% of the written comments requested more involvement with the special education process e.g., "I should have a copy of the IEP and plan on a regular basis with the special teacher." Finally, 14% were neutral, e.g., "No comment."

Consistency of Teacher Survey. To assess the consistency of the responses to survey items, comparisons were made between selected items on the teacher survey and corresponding items from the student IEP records review. These items included: knowledge that students with IEPs were enrolled in class; accuracy of naming the special education services available in their buildings; accuracy of reporting modifications of regular program; agreement between recorded attendance at IEP planning or review meetings and reported time in IEP meetings; agreement between survey respondents who indicated they had observed a demonstration of special education technique compared to those who said they had actually attended an inservice demonstration.

First, 83% of teachers accurately indicated that they had students with IEPs enrolled in their class. Second, the mean accuracy of teachers' reports of special education services in their respective buildings was 56% with a range of 44% to 81%. Third, 65% accurately indicated that they had designed modifications of the regular program. That is, 35% of the teachers indicated on the teacher survey that they had never designed modifications of the regular program but were actually implementing modifications to accommodate special education students as reported by the special education teacher in the records review process. Fourth, 64% of the teachers accurately indicated that they had attended IEP planning or review meetings. Fifth, 67% of the teachers had attended a demonstration of special education techniques which they had indicated as sometimes observing. In summary, accuracy between teacher survey and records review items consistently ranged from 56% to 83% with an average of 67% agreement.

Summary of Significant Relationships. Figure 6 shows the chi square analyses which yielded significant relationships between teacher survey items and program type, geography/population, grade level, special education training, skill level, experience, and having a copy of the IEP.

Several significant relationships were identified. Teachers' satisfaction with support was significantly associated with geography/population. Teachers in the more densely populated areas were more likely to report high levels of satisfaction. Teachers' knowledge of IEP students enrollment in class was associated with program type and skill level of the teacher. Teachers with students enrolled in resource specialist programs were more likely to accurately indicate the enrollment of students with IEPs as were teachers who reported higher skill levels in special education competencies were more accurate.

Further, teachers who reported that the IEP was helpful were more likely to have high skill levels for the special education competencies required for certification as an elementary teacher. Greater special education training in these competencies was correlated with accuracy in reporting modifications of regular programs.

On the job experience related to special education competencies was significantly correlated with teacher's referring to the IEP, knowledge of the law, and use of special education inservice events.

Attendance at IEP meetings was significantly associated with program type, grade level, and special education skill level and training.

Moreover, having a copy of the IEP was significantly associated with referring to the IEP, although having access to a copy was NOT signficantly associated with referring to the IEP.

FIGURE 6

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS FOR TEACHER SURVEY FINDINGS

Variable	Teacher Survey Item	X^2	Contingency Coefficient	p
Program Type	Refer to IEP	7.710	.362	.01
	Knowledge that Student with IEP Enrolled in Class	11.312	.426	.001
	Attendance at IEP Meetings	12.788	.444	.001
Population	Satisfaction with Support	14.725	.473	.001
Grade Level	Attendance at IEP Meetings	6.714	.338	.05
Skill Level	Knowledge that Students with IEPs Enrolled in Regular Class	7.731	.372	.05
	Helpfulness of IEP	6.012	.334	.05
	Attendance at IEP Meetings	6.714	.338	.05
Training	Agreement Modification	6.749	.342	.01
	Changes in Placement	17.621	.507	.01
	Attendance at IEP Meetings	6.180	.326	.05
Experience	Refer to IEP	6.274	.331	.05
	Changes in Placement	17.327	.503	.01
	Uses Special Education Inservice	7.714	.362	.05
	Knowledge of the Law	6.252	.330	.05
Personal Copy of IEP	Refer to IEP	5.961	.323	.05
	Helpfulness of IEP	4.761	.290	.05

Teacher Survey: Follow-up Interview Findings

Interviews with a random sample of survey respondents were intended to provide reliability (agreement) for the written survey results. The interview protocol focused on open ended questions in the areas of activities related to implementing IEPs, factors influencing their activities, effectiveness and efficiency of their work effort, barriers and problems related to effectiveness, recommended changes and suggestions for training.

Interviews were conducted at sites convenient to the teachers at schools or county offices and ranged from 20 to 45 minutes with an average of 30 minutes. Five teachers were interviewed individually, eight teachers were interviewed in pairs, and three teachers were interviewed as a trio. Teachers were asked ten questions with the interviewer writing down their answer verbatim. A second recorder participated on two occasions simultaneously recording teacher resposes to assure reliability of recorded responses. Verbatim responses were then analyzed and summarized as reported in the following six sections: sample description, activities and factors influencing activities, effectiveness, barriers and problems, and recommendations for changes and training.

Sample Description. The 16 teachers who participated in the interviews comprised 30% of the 53 survey respondents. Thirteen were female, three male; seven were from less populated areas and nine from more populated areas. Eight taught grades K-3, primary level, and eight taught grades 4-6, intermediate level. Teachers who were interviewed were compared to those who were not interviewed. No significant differences were obtained. Thus, it was assumed that the teachers who were interviewed were not significantly different from those who were not interviewed.

Teacher Activities in Implementing IEPs. The teachers were generally very modest in describing the specific activities related to their work with special education students. Several interviewees (12%) were extremely modest as evidenced by such comments as, "I use my regular techniques, nothing special" and then detailed specific modifications such as learning centers and assigning study buddies. This implies that the regular teachers did not perceive their techniques as special, which may account for the discrepancy between teachers' reports that they never modified their regular class (35% of the written survey respondents) and actual modifications. Several interviewees (12%) noted that the special student fit in without modifications and, indeed, one teacher remarked, "To me if they're going to be mainstreamed, that means they can do things without me standing over them."

The most frequently mentioned activity related to implementing modifications to accommodate the needs and abilitites of the student. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of those interviewed mentioned a wide variety of modifications including adapting assignments and materials, assigning tutors, scheduling more one-to-one teaching, providing rewards or notes to the special education teacher regarding student progess, curriculum modifications, and learning new techniques (specifically, signing). This provides reliability for the survey results on a similar item related to implementing modifications and is further supported by the results of the student IEP Records Review which noted that 61% of the regular teachers implemented some form of modification.

The next most frequently mentioned activity involved meeting with the special education teacher or resource specialist to discuss the IEP and check the progress of the students. This provides reliability for the survey results on a similar item related to interactions with people: 53% of survey respondents (n=53) reported interacting with the special education teacher, 50% reported interacting with the resource specialist, while 44% of the interviewees (n=16) mentioned this activity.

One interviewee (6%) reported receiving inservice training from her special educator as well as summer training in order to design a special curriculum to integrate students from the class for communicatively handicapped. This supports the survey item in which 8% of repondents reported receiving training from the special education teacher or resource specialist (13%).

Teachers reported a high degree of freedom in deciding what they would do in teaching their special education students: 75% of the interviewees said they had "a lot of freedom," "unlimited freedom," "complete freedom," or "total freedom." Moreover, 12% referred to a dependence on consensus with the special educator. Only one interviewee (6%) said "Not much freedom -- it's all prearranged." This sense of self-determination may be illustrated by one teacher's remark, "For self-contained (special class) kids, consensus is between the special education teacher, the psychologist, and me. They're pretty reasonable. I don't have to take the children, after all, they are the step children of the system."

Teachers named the child's needs and abilities or behavior as the most relevant factor influencing what they did to implement IEPs. Specifically, 50% of the interviewees referred to child variables; 50% referred to the resource teacher or special educator as the influential factor; 12% mentioned availability of appropriate curriculum; 18% referred to their personal judgment, and one teacher referred to state guidelines.

Teachers' responses varied widely when asked how they were different from other teachers. Several teachers (31%) noted, "That's difficult to answer because I never see other people teaching." This matched the majority of written survey respondents who said they never observed the special educator implementing special techniques. Indeed, 12% of those interviewed said, "I'm not that different." However, the majority (50%) mentioned personal characteristics as their point of difference ("I'm more soft spoken," "I'm more flexible," "I assert my authority," "I don't talk about them," and "I really care a lot for my kids"). Furthermore, 31% noted their clear expectations and standards in distinguishing themselves from others, and another 31% referred to added academic or time commitments. Comments included, "I probably put in more time to identify my kids (bilingual) for special education." "I do a great deal of individualized tutoring and curriculum design," and "I have more responsiblities for disciplining and parent conferences."

Effectiveness of Teachers. The 16 interviewees mentioned a total of 19 strengths. Sixty-one percent of the cited strengths related to the ability to establish rapport, integrate special education students, help students accept differences, and build self esteem. This matched the survey results where 59% of survey respondents reported a high degree of skill in promoting student growth in the affective domain and interpersonal relationships. The next most frequently cited strength was in academic areas (43%). Two interviewees (12%) felt their area of strength was in dealing with discipline problems.

The most frequently cited weakness (37%) was in scheduling enough time, planning, or waiting for help. In addition, 31% of the interviewees mentioned a weakness related to disciplining the special student within a large hetergeneous group. These results provide reliability for similar items in the written survey where 32% of survey respondents mentioned a lack of skill related to teaching nonacademic areas. Two teachers (12%) cited their inability to identify, assess, and evaluate progress of special education students. One teacher mentioned a need for more knowledge of the special curriculum and one teacher mentioned "red tape." Two teachers (12%) mentioned no weaknesses.

Barriers and Problems. The most frequently cited barrier to successful implementation was lack of time, mentioned by 43% (n=16) of the teachers interviewed.

Lack of knowledge or training was the next most frequently cited barrier (25%). The behavior of the large group, ability to deal with disruptive students, or difficulty in encouraging the special education student comprised the barriers for three interviewees (18%). One teacher referred to inadequate support and compensation, and one cited "too many kids."

Problems that teachers encountered in working with special education students predominantly focused on characteristics of these students. Specifically, 62% of the teachers who were interviewed mentioned characteristics such as "They take more time and energy," "Their disruptiveness and lack of communication," "Their inability to stay on task," and "Their lack of independence."

Systems problems were the next most frequently cited problems. Specifically, 37% of the interviewees described such problems as "working out the 'pull-out' schedule and the time when they will be pulled out," "...trying to fit the special education child into a slot in my classroom," and "My greatest problem is how to grade them."

Personal characteristics were cited as problems by four interviewees (25%) whose comments included "Learning to accept and appreciate their difference," "I need more training to do a good job to work with them," "I don't know how to overcome the problem of wanting them to do my assignment instead of the resource teacher's," and "I find it difficult to provide continuity of learning between my classroom and the resource room." One teacher noted, "I wonder who I owe my allegiance to...the other 30 kids or the one being mainstreamed? I wonder who I can test versus who I cannot and I feel that the parents of some special education children think we owe a debt to the child, expecting the school to provide all."

Satisfaction. Teachers were surprisingly satisfied, in spite of the barriers and problems. Seventy-five percent of the interviewees mentioned "I love it," or "I really love it" and "I was very satisfied with my work this year..even assigned two more students." This matches the teacher survey data where 82% of the respondents reported some level of satisfaction with student progress. The other 25% of interviewees based their satisfaction on whether or not their special education student(s) made adequate progress. Comments included "Mixed satisfaction...one showed great progress, one did not", and "I don't think I"ll ever be satisfied with special education kids. No matter how far they've come, it never seems to be enough."

Teachers were asked to describe the most satisfying aspects of their work with special education students. The majority of those interviewed (62%) cited the student's growth. Comments included, "Watching the kids grow;" "When parents express pleasure that the child showed a lot of progress;" "Seeing the kids function in the regular class;" "To see the child become comfortable with his or her self-image is most satifying," and "The whole class became more cooperative." Others mentioned "seeing mainstreaming work", "rising to the challenge." However, one teacher said, "I enjoy December better than September."

Teachers were also asked to describe the least satisfying aspects of their work with special education students. The most frequently cited negative aspect (31%) was "sending students on with unmet needs" and "lack of time to do all that is needed." However, 31%

also mentioned feeling a lack of appreciation or support. Three interviewees (18%) cited discipline problems and unmotivated students and three (18%) mentioned nonteaching duties or paperwork. One teacher cited lack of training, and one teacher mentioned no negative aspects.

Recommendations for Change. Half of the interviewees (50%) noted the need for changes related to training, and more time or more involvement with special education staff. This is epitomized by one teacher's statement: "The resource teacher had to spend time in being accountable and that took her away from interaction with the staff, so maybe if there was less paperwork, the resource specialist would have more time to talk with the faculty in an inservice role." This provides strong support for the written survey results which indicated that 62% of survey respondents used the special class or resource teacher in a consultation/training role. Over 25% of the unsolicited written comments also called for more involvement with the special education staff.

Less than half of the interviewees (43%) requested more involvement and knowledge related to the IEP.

This also matches written survey results wherein 37% indicated a desire to know more about the content of the IEP.

Several interviewees (18%) noted that there should be less emphasis on "the pull out model" and that there should be less separation and "privilege" associated with the special student. Over half of the interviewees (62%) recommended special education courses which focus on how to handle the special education student, learning how to participate in the IEP conference, how to recognize needs, and actual practice in increasing positive interactions between handicapped and nonhandicapped students. The majority of comments referred to actual practice: 25% recommended that there be an awareness of available services, "where to go for help", visitations of special facilities and programs, and a basic knowledge of the law. Further, teachers expressed a desire to maintain "ownership" of their special education students. The interviewees' strong focus on the need for training in actual practice was reflected in the written survey where 69% of survey respondents reported using inservice events. However, one teacher noted, "I'm not sure this is something you can be trained in...you just have to develop a good understanding of each individual need and then figure out ways to meet those needs." And one teacher warned, "Don't do it...it's a bad time for teaching now. There's no big need for teachers."

Summary of Results: A Vignette

The results of the student IEP review, written surveys, and follow-up interviews were combined to form a description of a typical elementary teacher's implementation of individualized education programs. The following vignette describes the interactions and instructional activities as well as special education knowledge, training, and competencies of the regular elementary teacher. It represents a composite of the average responses to the key variables associated with the student IEP records review, the written survey, and the interviews.

Mrs. Jones is a primary school teacher for a class of 30 students (16 boys and 14 girls.) Three of her students have individualized education programs (IEPs). Two are served by the resource specialist and one by the teacher for learning handicapped students. Mrs. Jones has been teaching for 10 years and has been in her current position for five years.

She occasionally encounters non-English or limited English speaking handicapped students, primarily Spanish speaking, but is monolingual herself. She holds a multiple subjects credential and is not enrolled in a program leading to a master's, doctoral or certification degree. However, she has participated in many inservice programs as part of her continuing professional development.

Mrs. Jones is aware of the California Master Plan for Special Education but is not too sure about P.L. 94-142 or the 504 regulations. She is aware that the California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing requires that all those who graduate from a basic elementary multiple subjects credential program must complete certain special education competencies. She reports that she's had training in the following special education competencies:

- recognizing special education student's academic strengths and weaknesses;
- assessing characteristics and behavior of exceptional students in terms of programs and developmental needs;
- recognizing differences and similarities

of exceptional and un-exceptional students;
- using various diagnostic/prescriptive materials and procedures in reading, language, math and perceptual/ motor development when appropriate;
- promoting student growth in the affective domain and interpersonal relations;
- applying diagnostic information towards the modification of traditional school curriculum and materials for selected students.

However, Mrs. Jones indicates she has had no training for five special education competencies:

- communicating appropriate information (related to special students) to other professionals and parents;
- analyzing non-discriminatory assessment, including a sensitivity to cultural and linguistic factors;
- producing and evaluating short and long-

term educational objectives for regular classroom aspects of the individualized educational program goals;

* identifying and teaching non-academic areas such as socialization skills, career and vocational education;
* understanding current special education legislation and concepts of least restrictive environment and due process for students, parents and teachers.

She reports that she has had on-the-job experience in all eleven competency areas, yet feels she has the least degree of skill for two competencies:

* understanding current special education legislation and concepts of least restrictive environment and due process for students, parents and teachers;
* analyzing non-discriminatory assessment, including a sensitivity to cultural and linguistic factors.

Her highest degree of skill is related to three competencies:

- promoting student growth in the affective domain and interpersonal relations;
- recognizing differences and similarities between exceptional and un-exceptional students;
- recognizing special education student's academic strengths and weaknesses.

In a typical work week, Mrs. Jones spends an average of 47 hours on the job. She interacts with a variety of special education personnel. Approximately one or two days a week she meets with the resource specialist and special class teacher to discuss her students' programs, clarify schedules and academic assignments, and describe problems in implementation.

Once or twice a month Mrs. Jones meets with other regular class teachers who have special education students to share problems and possible solutions, usually at lunch or over a cup of coffee. Sometimes she comes in contact with the school psychologist or program specialist, but she rarely interacts with her administrators (principal, assistant principal, or special education administrator) about her special education students. Twice a year she meets with the parents of her special students as part of regularly scheduled parent conferences. The resource specialist or the special class teacher typically joins her to meet with the parents.

In general, Mrs. Jones is quite satisfied with the nature and frequency of support she receives from the staff with whom she interacts regarding the IEPs for her students. She is most satisfied with the support received from the special educators, specifically the direct instruction time with the student, stress reduction and emotional support, and inservice demonstrations of special techniques or materials that work for the special education student.

Although Mrs. Jones is aware that she has students with IEPs in her class, she has not been highly involved in the formal aspects of the IEP process. She has most often been involved at the referral stage, in particular identifying those students who may be eligible for services. She has attended few IEP planning or review meetings, relying on the special educators to inform her. She does not have a copy of her students IEPs, but she has access to the copy kept by the special education teacher. She typically uses the IEP to review student progress, discuss the IEP with the special educators, and prepare progress reports for parent conferences, although she does so infrequently. Mrs. Jones finds the IEP document fairly helpful in carrying out her responsibilities for implementing the IEP.

Her students who receive special education from the resource specialist are typically removed from her regular academic classes: one student receives special instruction in reading, the other in math. Otherwise, they are included in all other academic and non-academic subjects. The student who receives special education in the special class for learning handicapped students joins her class for social studies, science and art, physical education, lunch and recess. The special class students and teacher aide join her class for assembly and field trips held once or twice a month. Moreover, Mrs. Jones has an arrangement where some of her non-handicapped students join the special class for special projects and tutoring twice a week. Mrs. Jones also feels free to ask the resource specialist or special class teacher to take one of her students on an extended basis in order to assist in diagnosing a learning or behavior problem.

Basically, Mrs. Jones spends most of her teaching time in activities related to monitoring the special education students or directly instructing them in small groups. Sometimes she finds she must spend time in one-to-one instruction. She spends very little or no time in activities related to due process or special education inservice and moderate amounts of time in planning, coordinating, or supervising special education programs. Overall, Mrs. Jones is satisfied with the actual time she spends in these activities, finding that she would ideally spend more time observing the implementation of special education techniques to learn practices effective with her students.

As a veteran with 10 years of experience, Mrs. Jones has participated in many inservice events. She appreciates the special education inservice she has received. She finds that consultations from the special educators and discussions with other regular class techers who have special education students are most helpful and useful. In general, Mrs. Jones' years of experience, special education training and skill level have contributed to her success in modifying her regular programs for the students with IEPs. Typically she finds that she must modify teaching processes, for example adapting the length or complexity of assignments. She has sometimes found a peer tutor helpful and occasionally she will use a completely different curriculum. She relies on the special educator to recommend and provide appropriate materials. Furthermore, Mrs. Jones finds her greatest strengths lie in helping the special student interact with the rest of the class.

There is a high degree of freedom for Mrs. Jones to decide what she will or will not do with her special education students. The most important factor which influences her activities is the child's specific needs and abilities. Mrs. Jones considers herself as more flexible than most other teachers and more specific about her expectations for all her students. This specificity enables her to better integrate the special student. In addition, she feels she is most effective in helping students establish rapport with each other and teaching academic subjects. However, she feels least effective in managing her time and occasionally she is unsure about disciplining some of her special students within large heterogeneous groupings. She finds that lack of time is the greatest barrier to implementing special education programs. Furthermore, she is not too sure about the specific services available to her students. Because her special students take more time and energy due to their lack of independence and ability to stay on task, she wonders what effect this has on her other students. Moreover, she finds it is often difficult to schedule time to meet with the people who can help her in designing programs and solving problems.

In spite of her busy work week and feelings of inadequacy in meeting the needs of all her students, Mrs. Jones would like to be even more involved with the IEP process. Overall, she is quite satisfied with her job, as evidenced by such enthusiastic comments as, "I really love my job! I was very satisfied with my work this year...even with adding two more students. I enjoy watching the kids grow...especially seeing the kids function in the regular class!"

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter the findings of the present study are discussed in terms of their implications for management, supervision and training of regular education teachers, future research related to implementation of IEPs, and special education policy.

It is clear that the regular class teachers in this study were struggling to cope with increased demands related to implementing IEPs. Their implementation patterns were consistently correlated with type of special education program, population, and skills, training, and experience with special education competencies. Although, they tended not to participate in formal aspects of the IEP process, they clearly were involved in the informal day-to-day implementation process. A substantial proportion of regular class teachers were actively involved in modifying their regular programs for mild to moderately handicapped students. They reported having considerable discretion as to the specific academic or nonacademic activites which were provided. Furthermore, regular class teachers reported frequent interactions with a variety of personnel in order to provide educational programs for students with IEPs. However, these meetings were more likely to be informal, and less likely to include the formal aspects of the IEP planning, writing, coordinating, or review process. The IEP document itself did not appear to be a major factor in determining the extent of the regular class teachers' involvement, although having a copy of the IEP did increase the likelihood of its use. More importantly, regular class teachers relied on special education personnel for the direction and substantive content related to the education of their special education students.

Given the high degree of involvement, time, and expertise required to develop IEPs, the disposition of IEPs following the planning process was of particular concern in this study. The results of this study indicate that some IEPs are read and used by regular class teachers, primarily to monitor and evaluate educational programs. This may be a function of direct involvement in the IEP process since the teachers who had attended IEP meetings as well as those who had a personal copy of the IEP were more likely to refer to it.

Furthermore, the intent of the legislation in encouraging instructional opportunities for handicapped students in regular classes appears to have been met. The majority of regular class teachers appeared to assume responsibility for the education of the special education students assigned to their classes. They appeared to be willing and able to modify the traditional curriculum to accomodate the unique needs and abilities of the students with IEPs.

These results may be interpreted in relation to the observations of Weatherley and Lipsky (1979) regarding the influence of "street level bureaucrats" on translating public policy into practice. In this study, the regular classroom teachers had substantial discretion in how they actually worked with the student as well as with the specialists involved with the student. Their daily routines included procedures for coping with the extra demands and pressures imposed by federal and state special education legislation. These routines were primarily outside the formal processes which special education professionals follow, relying more on informal relationships and processes.

The regular teachers' lack of involvement in the more formal aspects of the IEP process may be interpreted in several ways. First, there may be an informal division of labor wherein such responsibility for educating handicapped students is perceived to lie with the special educators. Second, there may be a lack of knowledge of the intent and provisions of the federal and state laws regarding the raison d'etre for the formal IEP process. Third, regular teachers may be excluded from the formal process by the demands of their teaching assignment. Finally, administrative arrangements may exclude regular teachers from the process. Most likely, each of these conditions contributes to the observed pattern of low involvement in the formal IEP process

The public policies related to serving special education students which were reflected in the teachers' operationalized daily routines included provision for instruction in the least restrictive environment (i.e., the regular classroom) and implementation of the IEP. The regular teacher voluntarily included a proportion of special education students who either did not need modifications of their regular education programs or for whom the teachers had a curriculum modification or special procedure which was effective for the student. In view of these results, the regular classroom teacher can be viewed as a policy maker, fulfilling the demands of the federal and state legislation within the constraints of limited expertise, lack of time, and increased work load.

Limitations of the Findings

The study focused on the role of regular elementary teachers in a system which has been, for the past five years, implementing the requirements of state and federal special education legislation which encourages integration of special education students in the regular classroom. Systems which have more recently begun to address legislative mandates may differ significantly.

One administrative difference between primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6) teachers is the departmental approach often found at the intermediate level. However, few correlations were found for grade level. Therefore, grade level may not be a variable which significantly affects the teacher's role. However, there may be other differences between regular elementary and secondary teachers' roles. Thus, only cautious generalization of the findings of this study to the role of secondary regular class teachers who implement IEPs may be warranted.

The random sampling process of this study yielded a distribution of IEPs for students with mild to severe handicaps. This particular random sample identified no regular class teachers involved in implementing IEPs for students with severe handicaps. Thus, it is not possible to determine to what extent teacher behaviors are similar or different when integrating students with severe handicaps.

The study focused on the perceptions and self report of elementary teachers' behaviors, activities and interactions on behalf of special education students. The validity of these perceptions and self-reported behaviors was established through a content analysis of their students' IEPs and follow-up oral interviews. No attempt was made to obtain perceptions of the regular class teacher's role from administrators, special educators, parents or advocates of handicapped students, or the handicapped students themselves. Furthermore, the study essentially focused on process variables (such as instructional activities) and presage variables (such as training or experience). The study did not evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher's role in accomplishing student achievement.

The major findings of the study are described according to percent of respondents for each teacher survey item and each student IEP records review item. This information provided a simple descriptive analysis. It should be noted that approximately 25% of the chi square analyses yielded associations at $p < .05$ criterion level. However, the relatively large number of independent tests used increases the probability of Type I errors in the study. Hence, "significance" of any single test must be interpreted with the utmost caution pending replication in subsequent research.

Finally, the findings of the study must be considered in the context of rapidly changing social policies concerning the education of handicapped children. Although the mandates and regulations of

P.L. 94-142 have been in effect since the mid 1970's, many school districts across the state and country are still struggling to bring their school services into compliance. Yet, even as this report is submitted, the federal department of education has requested that the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services deregulate P.L. 94-142. Especially for school systems which face increasing challenges for accountablity in the face of declining enrollments, increased staff professionalization and unionization, and shrinking resources, the indecision which arises from a movement to deregulate PL-94-142 adds still another challenge. Therefore, it is important that the research which documents the actual involvement of the regular class teacher's role in the day-to-day delivery of educational programs for handicapped students be interpreted accordingly.

The following implications of the study's findings are offered with the above caveats in mind.

IMPLICATIONS

Management and Supervision Implications

In light of the findings, regular and special education administrators should critically review their respective and collective supervision procedures to ensure adequate recognition of the role of the regular classroom teacher in implementing individualized educational programs. Several results of this study indicate that a) some regular teachers are involved in both the formal and informal aspects of implementing IEPs, and many more are involved in only the informal aspects; b) some regular teachers are receiving satisfactory levels of resource support in order to implement IEPs, and c) most regular teachers are modifying their programs to accommodate the special needs and abilities of students with IEPs.

There appear to be several key variables which are under the control of administrators and which are correlated with the regular teacher's role in implementing IEPs. Teachers must be made aware of the presence and characteristics of the special education students placed in their regular classrooms to effectively implement IEPs. This might be achieved by including these teachers in IEP meetings and/or providing them with a personal copy of the IEP for each child assigned to their classroom. While the logistics of having regular class teachers attend IEP meetings may present some difficulties, the value of having these teachers attend the meetings, in terms of increased awareness of special education students placed in class and greater utilization of IEPs, should override such difficulties. IEP meetings could be scheduled in the late afternoon, or substitute teachers or aides be utilized to allow regular class teachers to attend these meetings. Further, according to recent policy guidelines, regular teachers who do not attend IEP meetings for their special education students, should either meet with special educators to be informed about those students, or receive a copy of the IEP.

Similarly, logistical problems may surface in the provision of personal copies of IEPs to all regular teachers serving special children. However, the empirical data clearly suggest that teachers who have a personal copy of the IEP refer to it to discuss the program with the special educator and view it as helpful in providing educational services to the student. Provision of a copy to special educators or other personnel to which the regular teacher can refer was not found to be an adequate alternative. Further, recent state legislation mandates the provision of a copy to all persons providing special education or related services which includes any teacher who modifies the regular education program to meet the needs of a special child.

Communication and coordination of IEP implementation efforts between regular and special educators is another area in which administrative changes might have a positive effect. The importance of the resource support and coordinative functions of special educators for effective implementation of IEPs was evident in all sources of data in this study as well as in other studies (Safer, et al., 1979, Craig, et al., 1980). Administrators should take steps to facilitate communication and coordination between regular and special educators. Specific procedures might include scheduling or providing teachers opportunities to schedule informal meetings to discuss student programming and progress, providing regular and special educators opportunities to observe their students in other classrooms, i.e., in special and regular classes respectively, and designating someone, either the regular or special educators, as responsible for coordinating IEP implementation activities, and monitoring the coordinators' performance of his/her role.

As reported by others (Safer, et al., 1979), time management was found to be a critical variable in the implementation of IEPs. As indicated from the teacher interviews, lack of time for instructional planning was the most pressing barrier to effectively implementing IEPs. Teachers need adequate time for instructional planning, attending IEP meetings, meeting with special education personnel and parents to discuss programs, and learning new special education teaching techniques. Administrators should recognize this need and assist teachers in making time for the necessary activities. Establishing periods of time for specific purposes such as instructional planning and meetings might facilitate these processes. Further, training teachers in time management skills and monitoring their use of non-instructional time could promote better use of the limited time available.

Training Implications

Several findings of this study have implications for the training of regular education teachers responsible for working with special education students. The most relevant of these findings relates to characteristics of the regular teachers.

Teachers' knowledge of relevant legislation was found to be generally limited. More than half were aware of California special education legislation, but less than half were familar with the CTPL competencies, and even fewer knew about federal special education requirements. Knowledge of the laws was associated with knowledge of the state special education competencies, and knowledge of these competencies was related to participation in inservice training. Thus, inservice training for regular educators should address federal special education legislation as well as state laws in competency requirements.

Teachers' knowledge of the special education services available at their school sites also emerged as a significant factor in implementation. Generally, regular class teachers were not highly aware of the available special education services in their respective schools. They achieved an average accuracy of 56% in naming the special education services available to their students. Teachers' effectiveness in meeting students' special needs is clearly limited by their awareness of the services and resources available. Inservice training should address this area with the goal of increasing regular teachers' knowledge of the special services and educational resources available at their school and in the community.

Perhaps most critical to the training of regular educators is the observed relationship between special education and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching skills and IEP implementation patterns. Most teachers reported moderate ratings of their skills, training, and experience regarding the special education and diagnostic/prescriptive competencies assessed. Special education skill levels of teachers were significantly associated with knowledge that a special education student was enrolled in their class, higher rating of helpfulness of the IEP, and greater attendance at IEP meetings. These findings are consistent with those reported by Safer, et al., (1979), and Redden and Blackhurst (1977). Training in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching was significantly correlated with knowledge that modification of the regular program was included in the IEP, and attendance at IEP meetings. Experience with special education skills was associated with participation in inservice training programs. Clearly, regular teachers would benefit from training in special education and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching techniques.

Direct instructional methods and behavior management techniques were identified as the areas in which teachers most desired training. Consultation with and observation of special education teachers surfaced as the preferred mode of inservice training. Inservice training programs should address these areas and modalities accordingly.

These findings suggest another topical area for inservice training of regular educators. Teachers repeatedly cited the value of working with special educators for increasing their effectiveness on implementing IEPs. Correspondingly, training should focus on increasing the collaborative skills of regular teachers, as well as special educators, toward the goal of ongoing collaborative efforts. Enhanced communication between regular and special educators would certainly promote coordination of planning and implementation activities among these educators.

Further, the results of this study suggest that regular teachers have many successful teaching procedures which would allow them to act as coordinate status consultants (Johnson, 1975) to each other and with special educators. Inservice training events should be particularly sensitive to their already existing skills and knowledge, and should incorporate collaboration in exchanges between special and regular teachers.

Finally, the respondents in this study were not differentiated according to grade level or population density. Thus, inservice events can be designed to capitalize on the diversity and heterogenity represented by practicing teachers, instead of separating them according to specific teaching roles (e.g., primary vs. intermediate) or population (e.g., rural versus urban).

Research Implications

It is recommended that additional research be undertaken to identify those administrative and educational practices which enhance the involvement of regular class teachers in implementing IEPs and the effectiveness of such implementation. A large proportion of the teachers in this study noted the use of "effective practices" in integrating their special education students. However, many of the regular class teachers in this study did not perceive their modifications of the regular program as special education. Yet, without those modifications, many students with IEPs might not have been accommodated in the regular classroom. These practices should be identified to determine their value for mainstreaming special education students and for education in general.

One area worthy of further research is based on the apparent reciprocal nature of the regular and special education systems. Regular classroom teachers reported sending nonhandicapped students to special classes for reasons ranging from being tested as a possible IEP candidate, to receiving special education instruction, to being a tutor of handicapped students. This activity level was differentially related to the type of special classroom. Non-handicapped students attended the resource room more frequently than special classes for learning, communicatively, or severely handicapped pupils. This finding represents a novel pattern of informal "reverse mainstreaming" for academic and nonacademic activities. This was an unexpected outcome of the study and needs further research to determine the extent and nature of the informal reciprocal interactions between the regular and special education subsystems.

Because this study limited its focus to the role of regular elementary teachers in implementing IEPs, further research is needed to clarify the role of regular teachers at the secondary level. This is of particular importance in view of the fact that the service delivery system at the secondary level is quite different.

Future research efforts which analyze the role of regular teachers should be enhanced by the current attempt to generate a standardized measure of participation and involvement. This study generated an instrument designed to describe the teacher's knowledge, activities, interactions, satisfaction and overall work effort related to teaching special education students. Replication of the current study using similar measures should yield valuable data.

Additionally, quasi-experimental studies of IEP implementation are needed to confirm the relationships among variables in the IEP planning and implementation process tentatively identified in this study, and to discover new relationships among document, environmental, service provider, and child characteristics. Finally, the effects of IEP implementation practices on child performance must ultimately be assessed to determine the value of the IEP process as a whole as well as the effects of its many components.

Policy Implications

The policy implications of the results may be understood in relation to Weatherley and Lipsky's observations (1979) regarding the effects of policy on the practices of "street level bureaucrats." Reported practices were clearly inconsistent with certain legal requirements. Most notable was the disparity between IEP contents and the actual individualized education program. Many IEPs lacked specification of the modifications of the regular classroom actually being implemented. All such special education and related services must be included in the IEP by law. Assuming that correspondence between policy and practice should be maximized, either the regulations regarding IEP contents should be revised or related practices should be modified. Revision of regulations to correspond to these practices would involve removing the requirements for specification of modifications of the regular classroom. However, removal of the mandate might ultimately reduce the implementation of effective modifications currently specified in some IEPs.

Practice changes would involve either revising the IEP to match implementation activities or adjusting educational practices to conform with IEP specifications. Revising the IEP to include actual modifications may be appropriate. However, it would be extremely difficult and lengthy to specify these modifications in much detail. Similarly it might be counter-productive to limit needed educational services to those listed in the IEP. Thus, certain discrepancies between policy and practice may be functional if not desirable in terms of fulfilling the intent of the policies. Indeed, the specification of goals and objectives is the primary domain of social and educational policy. Thus, to this end, IEP mandates appear to be effective. The areas in which educational practices deviated from policy mandates appear to reflect constructive problem solving on the part of regular teachers in terms of promoting student development.

To the extent that the IEP is a statement of goals, actions and the commitment of resources, it is comparable to a policy. Accordingly, a discrepancy between policy and practice may exist if there are differences between IEP contents (policy) and IEP implementation (practice). That is, minor discrepancies between IEP contents and implementation practices may be functional and desirable if the IEP is intended to serve as a general guide for evaluating student progress on the stated educational goals (CFR, 1981). Given that teachers in this study most often utilized the IEP to review student's progress, this purpose appears to be at least partially fulfilled despite discrepancies which may exist between contents and practice. Further, the implementation of modifications not included in the IEP meets the primary purpose of current special education legislation, i.e., providing an appropriate individualized educational program in the regular education program to the maximum extent possible.

Other practices and reported deviations from policy are not as equivocal in terms of fulfilling special education and IEP goals. While the IEP meeting may facilitate communication between parents and some school personnel such as the special education teacher or resource specialist, as suggested by the Office of Special Education (CFR, 1981), this effect largely precludes regular class teachers given their low frequency attendance at IEP meetings. The implication for policy is to mandate the inclusion of regular class teachers in IEP meetings. However, considering the reported time constraints of regular teachers, this policy would be difficult to implement. An alternative policy would be to require periodic meetings between regular and special educators for teachers who cannot attend formal IEP meetings. This is highly consistent with practices reported in this study. Recent recommendations following this direction have been made by the Federal Office of Special Education (CFR, 1981).

The management, monitoring, and compliance functions of the IEP suggested by the Office of Special Education seem to apply to a relatively small proportion of regular teachers, since few teachers actually received copies of the IEP for their handicapped students and even fewer used the IEP as a guide for provision of educational services. As indicated earlier, recent State legislation has mandated the provision of a copy of the IEP to all personnel responsible for implementing any part of the document. However, whether the regular educator is responsible for implementing any part of the IEP remains a critical issue for policy makers. If modifications of the regular program are specified in the IEP, the regular teacher seems to have a clear role in implementation. However, if no such modifications are included in the document, the regular teachers role in implementation is amorphous.

Perhaps the most critical finding of this study for special education policy is the determination that regular teachers play a large part in the education of most handicapped children. Current legislation defines the role of the regular educator primarily by omission. That is, special education policies say little regarding the activities of the regular educator in the IEP process. While this affords the regular teacher some valuable discretion in educating their handicapped students, it also results in highly variable treatment of these students, with unknown effects. Unless the role of the regular teacher is formally addressed in special and regular education policies, particularly IEP regulations, the goals and educational program for the handicapped child in the regular classroom will remain unspecified and therefore difficult to evaluate. Further, regular teachers will have to continue to educate the handicapped students in their classrooms without optimal support, recognition, and involvement until their role is addressed in educational policy.

Finally, the policy implications of the finding that regular teachers sent non-handicapped students to special education classes deserves particular attention. The various reasons for this "reverse mainstreaming" trend have different implications for special education policy. Informal referral of regular education students to the special class for testing and/or instruction clearly contradicts current legislation. However, this practice attests to the daily exigencies of dealing with students in need of immediate assistance beyond that which the regular teacher can provide either due to limited skills or environmental constraints. Further, the practice reflects a need to circumvent the formal special education process of referral, assessment, and IEP planning. This trend, including sending regular education students to special classes for non-academic activities, may also reflect an informal exchange system through which special and regular educators achieve optimal class compositions and size for particular activities. Reverse mainstreaming for participation in non-academic activities and for peer tutoring appear to fulfill the goal of maximizing the education of handicapped students with non-handicapped students as well as meeting the daily needs of regular and special educators. Clearly, a more flexible legislative policy, addressing the day to day needs of regular and special educators at the school site level may fulfill the objectives of special and regular education policies, i.e., maximizing the education of all children.

The discussion and implications of this study are made in the spirit of adding to the growing knowledge and data base which has documented the effectiveness of implementing IEPs. It is clear that neither litigation nor legislation ensures that educational practices will change as directed. Indeed, it has taken over 25 years of court action and, for some school systems, contingent withdrawal of federal funds, to implement the 1954 Brown vs Board of Education desegregation decree. It is anticipated that it will not take such time or contingencies to implement P.L. 94-142. The degree of compliance to a law or regulation must be balanced with the extent of commitment to the intent of the law. Clearly P.L. 94-142 and corresponding state legislation have commanded the attention of public school personnel. Because one of the underlying intents of P.L. 94-142 and the California Master Plan for Special Education is to ensure that handicapped and non-handicapped students have increased opportunitites to learn together, the role of the regular class teacher in implementing IEPs has a special place in assuring the achievement of that intent.

REFERENCES

Alper, T. Individual educational plans: How well do they work? Technical report submitted to California Department of Education. Hayward, CA: California State University, Department of Educational Psychology, 1978.

Barr, A., Goodnight, J., Sall, J., Blair, W., & Chilco, D. _Statistical Analysis System (SAS) User's Guide_. Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, Inc., P.O. Box 10066, 1979.

Blankenship, C., & Lilly, M. S. Essentials of special education for regular educators. _Teacher Education and Special Education_, 1977, _1_(1), 28-35.

Blaschke, C. _Case study of the implementation of P.L. 94-142_. Washington, D.C.: Education Turnkey Systems, 1979.

California Master Plan for Special Education, Education Code--Part 30--Special Education Programs. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, CA, 1981.

Craig, P., Miller, C., Wujek, M., & Herschberger, A. _Independent evaluation of the California Master Plan for Special Education_. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1980.

Crowell, A., & Rucker, C. Influence and regular education involvement on child study teams. In J.A.C. Vautour and C. Rucker (Eds.), _Child study team training program: A book of readings_. Austin, Texas. Special Education Association, 1977.

Danielson, L., Fenton, K., Morra, L., Morrissey, P., & Kennedy, M. _Progress toward a free appropriate public education (A_ report to Congress on the implementation of P.L. 94-142: The education of all handicapped children act.) Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1979.

Deutsch, M., & Kraus, R. (Eds.) Theories in social psychology. Chapter 6: Role Theory. New York, 1969.

Dickson, R., & Costa, C. A data base for implementation of the individualized education program Los Angeles, CA: Presentation at American Educational Research Association, 1981. Education Code. 1980.

Federal Register, 45(121a), July, 1980.

Federal Register, 46(12), January 1981.

Fenton, K., Yoshida, R., Maxwell, J., & Kaufman, M. Recognition of team goals: An essential step toward rational decision making. Exceptional Children, 1979, 638-644.

Gilliam, J., & Coleman, M. Who influences IEP committee decisions? Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 642-645.

Glaser, E. Putting knowledge to use. Los Angeles, CA: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1976.

Goldstein, S., Stickland, B., Turnbull, A., & Currey, L. An observational analysis of the IEP conference. Exceptional Children, 1980, 278-286.

Hasazi, S. The consultant teacher. In J. Jordan (Ed.), Teacher, please don't close the door. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Helge, D. Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 514-520.

Johnson, R. Coordinate status consultation model. In C. Parker

(Ed.), Psychological consultation: Helping teachers meet special needs. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Jordan, J. (Ed.) Exceptional students in secondary schools. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Knight, M., Meyers, H., Hasazi, S., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Nevin, A. A four year evaluation of consulting teacher services. Behavior Disorders, 1981, 92-100.

Marver, J., & David, J. Three states' experiences with individualized education program requirements similar to P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1978. (Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA: Project 4537, Research Report EPRC23.)

Miller, G. Final report of the state program audit of the Santa Barbara County Special Education Services Region. Sacramento, CA: Office of Special Education, California Department of Education, 1981.

Miller, T., & Sabatino, D. An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1978, 85-93.

Morse, W., Cutler, R., & Fink, A. Public school classes for the emotionally handicapped: A research analysis. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1964.

Public Law 94-142, 94th Congress, S.6. November 29, 1975.

Pugach, M. Regular classroom teacher involvement in the development and utilization of individualized educational programs. Champaign-Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, Unpublished manuscript, Department of Special

Education, 1980.

Redden, M., & Blackhurst, A. Edward. Mainstreaming competency specifications for elementary teachers. Exceptional Children, 1977, 615-617.

Safer, H., Kaufman, M., & Morrissey, P. Implementation of IEPs: New teacher roles and requisite support systems. In E. Meyen, G. Vergason, & R. Whelan (Eds.), Instructional planning for exceptional children. Denver: Love Publsihing Co., 1979.

Schram, L., & Windmiller, R. School site and area individualized educational program team procedural handbook. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbaa County Special Education Services Region, 1980.

Semmel, D., & Morgan, W. Variables influencing educators' attitudes toward IEPs for handicapped children. Bloomington, IN: Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, 1978.

Semmel, D. The development and demonstration of a media ascendant simulation on individual education programs for personnel serving the handicapped. Final Report. Bloomington, IN: Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, 1980.

Stearns, M. Greene, D., & David, J. Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: First year report of a longitudinal study. Menlo Park, CA: Education Research Center, SRI International, 1980.

Vautour, J., & Rucker, C. The efficacy of child study teams. In J.A.C. Vautour and C. Rucker (Eds.), Child study team training program: A book of readings. Austin, Texas: Special Education Association, 1977.

Walker, H. The IEP as a vehicle for delivery of special education and related services to handicapped children. In Developing criteria for the evaluation of IEP provisions. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education of the Handicapped, 1978.

Weatherley, R., & Lipsky, M. Street level bureaucrats and institutional innovation. Harvard Education Review, 1977, 47 (2), 171-197.

Windmiller, R. Report of the 1979-80 Compliance Reviews. Santa Barbara, CA: Special Education Services Region, 1980.

Windmiller, R. (Personal communication with Scott McCann, September, 24, 1981).

Zinck, R. Ann. The development of a working paper for improving the efficiency of the individualized education program. Technical Report submitted to the Office of Special Education, California Department of Education, Stockton, CA: University of the Pacific, Bureau of Educational Research, 1980.

APPENDIX 1

INSTRUMENTS

Compliance Review Protocol

Teacher Survey

(PROTOCOL DEVELOPED BY SESR STAFF FOR 1981 REVIEWS)

REVIEWER____________________ PROGRAM CODE____________________

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES REGION
COMPLIANCE REVIEW

I. ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN NEED OF SPECIAL EDUCATION MUST BE IDENTIFIED, LOCATED AND EVALUATED. (121a.220) (20 U.S.C. 1414(a)(1)(A))

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Is there written documentation of a referral?					
No referral located					
Yes					
2. Is there documentation that the parents were notified of the referral?					
No					
Yes					
Unable to determine					

II. EACH LEA SHALL ESTABLISH AND IMPLEMENT PROCEDURES CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL AND STATE LAW FOR EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF AN INDIVIDUAL WITH EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS. (121a.530) (20 U.S.C. 1412(5)(C)) 5 CAC (3152)(C)

3. When was the child most recently assessed?					
No assessment located					
More than three years ago					
Less than three years ago					
Unable to determine					
4. Is there documentation that the parents were notified in writing prior to the most recent assessment?					
No					
Yes					
Unable to determine					
5. Was the most recent assessment completed within fifty (50) days from the date permission to assess was received?					
No assessment located					
No					

Number 5 continues on next page.

COMPLIANCE REVIEW

PROGRAM CODE 163

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5
5. Continued					
Yes					
Unable to determine					

6. Which of the following was included in the written record of the assessment?

No record located					
Information from only one source					
Evidence of multi-disciplinary assessment					

III. AN INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM SHALL BE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED FOR EACH HANDICAPPED CHILD. (121a.341)(5 CAC 3154 (a))

7. Who of the following were in attendance at the most recent planning meeting to develop the IEP?

No meeting held					
School administrator or designee					
Parent					
Student					
Special education teacher					
Regular education teacher					
Psychologist					
Program specialist					
Counselor					
Nurse					
Speech/language therapist					
Pupil services worker					
Representative from non-public school agency					
Others					

8. If the parent(s) was not in attendance at the most recent planning meeting for the development or change of the IEP, what documentation is there of attempts to insure parent participation?

Parent attended					
Record of telephone contacts					

Number 8 continues on the next page.

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5
8. Continued					
Copies of correspondences with parents					
Copies of parent responses					
Records of home visits					
No documentation found					
9. Which of the following describes the status of the student's IEP?					
No IEP found					
Partial IEP found					
IEP fully implemented					
IEP partially implemented (complete Number 16)					
Reason for non-implementation given					
10. Which of the following are included in the current IEP?					
No IEP found					
Present level of educational performance					
Not included					
Included					
Goals					
Not included					
Included					
Objectives					
Not included					
Included					
Statement of specific special education and related services to be provided					
Not included					
Included					
Career and vocational education program (if applicable)					
Not included					
Included					
Not applicable					

Number 10 continues on the next page.

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5

10. Continued
Extent to which student will participate in the regular program (if special class)

Not included					
Included					
Not applicable					

Anticipated duration of program

Not included					
Included					

IV. BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL PLACEMENT IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT WILL BE BASED ON THE PUPIL'S IEP AND WILL ADHERE TO PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS REGARDING THE PLACEMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WITH EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS. (121a.550, 121a.552)(20 U.S.C. 1412(5)(B);1414(a)(1)(iv)

11. Is there documentation that the parent was notified in writing prior to the placement of the student?

No					
Yes					
Notification given after placement					
Unable to determine					

12. Is there documentation that the parent gave written permission prior to the placement of the student?

No					
Yes					
Consent given after placement					
Unable to determine					

V. EACH PUPIL'S IEP SHALL BE REVIEWED PERIODICALLY AND NOT LESS THAN ANNUALLY. (121a.534)(5 CAC 3154)

13. If the student has been enrolled for more than one year, is there evidence that a review of the IEP has occurred?

No					

Number 13 continues on next page.

COMPLIANCE REVIEW PROGRAM CODE________________

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5
13. Continued					
Yes					
Enrolled less than one year					
14. If a review has taken place, who participated?					
Administrator or designee					
Parent					
Regular education teacher					
Special education teacher					
Program specialist					
Psychologist					
Pupil					
Nurse					
Other					
Not applicable					
15. If a student has been enrolled in the resource specialist program for more than one year, is there documentation of a health and psychological screening?					
No					
Yes					
Not applicable					
16. If the student's IEP has not been fully implemented, indicate which placement, service, or other element of the IEP is not being provided.					
Resource specialist program					
Special class					
Speech/language therapy					
Psychological services (counseling)					
Adaptive Physical Education					
Career or vocational preparation					
Audiological services					
Orientation/mobility instruction					

Number 16 continues on next page.

COMPLIANCE REVIEW

PROGRAM CODE________________

	PUPIL NUMBER				
	1	2	3	4	5
16. Continued					
Home/Hospital Instruction					
Services of an itinerant VH, AH, OH teacher					
Recreation therapy					
Special transportation					
Amount of integration					
Other (please specify)					

FINDINGS:

QUESTIONNAIRE

INVOLVEMENT OF REGULAR CLASS TEACHER IN IMPLEMENTING INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

FOR THE

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STUDY ON ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Return within two weeks to:

IEP Research Project
c/o R. Windmiller/A. Nevin
Santa Barbara Special Education
Services Region
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
(805) 961-4454

PART I: The questions in this section are about your work as a regular classroom teacher.

1. What is your present position? Primary (K-3) ☐ Middle (4-6) ☐

2. How long have you held this position in this district? ____________

3. How many years of teaching experience have you had? (circle number)

   1. 1-5 years
   2. 6-10 years
   3. 11-15 years
   4. 16-20 years
   5. 21-25 years
   6. over 25 years

4. Do you have teaching responsibilities with more than one classroom?

   ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, please describe. ____________

   ____

5. How many hours do you actually work during a typical week. ____________ Hours

6. As a regular classroom teacher, how frequently do you encounter non-English or limited English speaking handicapped students? (circle number)

   1. never
   2. occasionally
   3. frequently
   4. more or less daily

   (If you do encounter non-English or limited English speaking handicapped students, what language(s) do they speak?)

   ____

   ____

7. Are you bilingual? ☐ Yes ☐ No If YES, what language(s) do you speak?

   ____

   ____

8. For the 1980-1981 school year,

   What is your class size?____________ Number of girls ____________

   Number of boys____________ Number of girls with IEPs____________

   Number of boys with IEPs ____________

9.1 What special education services are available in your building? (check all that apply)

☐ Self-contained Classroom for Learning Handicapped Students (LH)
☐ Resource Specialist (RS)
☐ Communicatively Handicapped (CH)
☐ Severely Handicapped (SH)
☐ Psychologist

☐ Itinerant Consultant
☐ Special School (please name the school) ______________________
☐ Speech and Language Therapy
☐ Don't Know

☐ Other (please specify all others) ______________________________

9.2 How many students from special classes for the learning handicapped (LH) do you include in your classroom activities? How many students from classes for the communicatively handicapped (CH) or severely handicapped (SH) are included in the following regular classroom activities? (circle the special class and write the number)

Math class	CH______	LH______	SH______
Reading class	CH______	LH______	SH______
Social Studies class	CH______	LH______	SH______
Music class	CH______	LH______	SH______
Art class	CH______	LH______	SH______
Physical Education	CH______	LH______	SH______
Other (please specify)	CH______	LH______	SH______

____

10. Do any of your non-handicapped students go into the special classes on your campus?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how many students are involved and what do they do?

CH class ______ ______________________________

LH class ______ ______________________________

SH class ______ ______________________________

Resource specialist

______ ______________________________

Speech Therapy

______ ______________________________

Other (specify):______________________________

______ ______________________________

11. How many special education students were assigned to you during the 1980-81 school year? (Include those who moved away or transferred to other programs.) (write number)

____________ students

12.1 Do you have a copy of the Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) of special education students assigned to your class? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, please skip to the next item.

12.2 If yes, how often do you refer to it while you are teaching or interacting with students. (circle number)

Never	Once of Twice per year	Occasionally (1-2 days per month)	Frequently (1-2 days per week)	Daily
1	2	3	4	5

12.3 If no, do you have access to a copy? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, where is the IEP located? (check all that apply)

With resource room teacher ______

With special education teacher ______

With central office files ______

With psychologist ______

With speech therapist ______

Other (please specify) ____________________________

Don't know ______

12.4 Under what conditions, or for what purposes, do you refer to the IEP? (circle all that apply)

1. In order to prepare daily lessons
2. In order to review the student's progress
3. In order to prepare a report of student progress for parent conference
4. In order to discuss IEP with special education teacher
5. In order to supervise aides or tutors who are working with the student
6. Other (please specify)____________________________________
7. I don't refer to it

12.5 In your opinion to what extent is the IEP useful or helpful to you in carrying out your responsibilities? (circle number)

Not at all helpful	Somewhat helpful	Fairly helpful	Very helpful	Extremely helpful
1	2	3	4	5

13. What revisions or provisions should be included in the IEP in order to increase its usefulness?

	CHECK ONE MORE specific	LESS specific
1. Goals and objectives should be	☐	☐
2. Assessment information should be	☐	☐
3. Support services should be	☐	☐
4. Evaluation procedures should be	☐	☐

5. Other (please specify) ______________________________

14. I am not that familiar with what goes into an IEP ____________
I would like to learn more about the content of an IEP ____________

15. To what extent do you interact with the following people in relationship to the special education students who are assigned to your class? (circle appropriate reply)

KEY	Never	Rarely 1-5 times per year	Occasionally 1-2 days per month	Frequently 1-2 days per week	Daily
a) Other regular class teachers	n	r	o	f	d
b) The student's special class teacher(s)	n	r	o	f	d
c) Designated instruction and services (DIS) instructors	n	r	o	f	d
d) Special education aides	n	r	o	f	d
e) Principals/vice principals	n	r	o	f	d
f) Program specialists	n	r	o	f	d
g) Resource specialists	n	r	o	f	d
h) School psychologists	n	r	o	f	d
i) Special education administrator	n	r	o	f	d
j) School nurse	n	r	o	f	d
k) Teacher aides	n	r	o	f	d
l) The special student's parents	n	r	o	f	d
m) Other (please specify) ______________	n	r	o	f	d

16. What is the nature of the support you receive from the following people in relation to your work with special education students? (please circle)

KEY

(n) If you receive no support
(s) If you receive special materials/ideas
(d) If the person provides direct instructional time with the students
(e) If you receive emotional support/stress reduction
(t) I you receive training in special techniques

Also, please indicate how satisfied you are with the support you receive related to special education students. (please circle)

(1) Not at all (2) Fairly (3) Very (NA) Not applicable

	SUPPORT					SATISFACTION			
a) Other regular class teachers	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
b) The student's special class teacher(s)	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
c) Designated instruction and services (DIS) instructors	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
d) Special education aides	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
e) Principals/vice principals	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
f) Program specialists	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
g) Resource specialists	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
h) School psychologists	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
i) Special education administrator	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
j) School nurse	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
k) Teacher aides	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
l) The special student's parents	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA
m) Other (please specify) ________	n	s	d	e	t	1	2	3	NA

17. To what extent are you satisfied with with the progress of the special education student(s) assigned to your classroom. (circle number)

Not at all Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU!!

You have completed PART I. Please continue with PART II which asks important questions related to your actual teaching interactions with special education students.

PART II. For the handicapped learners assigned to your classroom how do you distribute your work time. Do you feel you should less, more, or about the same. Circle response appropriate to you.

	TIME I ACTUALLY SPEND					TIME I SHOULD SPEND		
KEY:	Never	Rarely 1-5 days per year	Occasionally 1-2 days per month	Frequently 1-2 days per week	Daily	Less	More	Same
ACTIVITY								
1. Initiate referral process	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
2. Conduct tests and assessment designed to identify special students strengths and weaknesses	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
3. Write behavioral objectives to meet the needs of handicapped learners	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
4. Work with special educator to interpret tests and assessment information	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
5. Work with special educator to write individualized education program	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
6. Design modification(s) of the regular program	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
7. Employ special supplementary materials or aids	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
8. Complete forms related to serving special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
9. Monitor/evaluate progress of special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
10. Meet with parents of special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
11. Participate in IEP planning or review meeting to write or revise programs	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s

ACTIVITY	TIME I ACTUALLY SPEND					TIME I SHOULD SPEND		
12. Implement procedures specifically designed to discipline special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
13. Intervene with non-handicapped students who are negatively interacting with handicapped students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
14. Implement curriculum promote positive interacting between non-handicapped and handicapped students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
15. Engage in telephone communication related to sp. ed. students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
16. Interact with other professionals (e.g., nurses, physicians, psychologists, occupational or physical therapists)	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
17. Provide one-to-one instruction (tutorial) for the sp. ed. students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
18. Provide small group instruction which includes the special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
19. Participate in due process hearing	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
20. Supervise peer tutors who are assigned to sp. ed. students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
21. Supervise classroom aides or volunteers who work with special education students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
22. Observe special educator implementing special ed. techniques	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
23. Consult with other regular teachers who work with sp. ed. students	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
24. Participate in school or district committee work for special education services	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
25. Learn to implement an educational practice which helps a special education student	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s

Now that Part II is completed, just a few more minutes of your time and you will have completed the entire survey.

ON TO PART III

PART III. The questions in this section concern your training experience.

1. What type of credential(s) do you hold?

    1. Teaching credential(s)
    2. Special credential(s)
    3. Administration credential(s)
    4. Other credential(s) or authorization(s)

2. Are you now enrolled or have you completed a graduate degree or other certification program in addition to your credential? (please describe)

    1. Master's degree (specify area)

    2. Doctoral degree (specify area)

    3. Other certification (specify)

3. How knowledgeable are you with the following special education laws?

    1. P.L. 94-142
    2. California Master Plan
    3. 504 Regulations

4. What inservice experience related to special eduation have you received during the last year? Please rate the unefulness of each inservice event.

Inservice Event and Topic	Check here if you received inservice event	DID NOT Receive	Usefulness				
			Not Useful at all		Somewhat		Extreme Usefu
University Extension Course			1	2	3	4	5
Summer Special Education Course			1	2	3	4	5
Consultation from Special Education Teacher			1	2	3	4	5
Workshop (specify topic(s))			1	2	3	4	5
Visitation to an Exemplary Program			1	2	3	4	5
Discussion with Other Regular Class Teachers Who Have Special Education Students			1	2	3	4	5
Observation of a Demonstrated Technique			1	2	3	4	5
Review of Literature or Article			1	2	3	4	5
Attendance at Professional Conference			1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify)			1	2	3	4	5

5. The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing requires that all those who graduate from basic multiple subjects credential programs must complete certain special eduation competencies. Are you aware of these competencies? disagree?

   1. ☐ Yes 2. ☐ No

6. Training and Experience

   Do you have any formal training and/or job-related experience in the following activities? How skilled do you think you are in each activity? In column 1, please indicate whether or not you've had formal training in the activity; in column 2, whether or not you've had job-related experience; in column 3, the degree of skill you have.

	1 Training		2 Experience		3 Degree of Skill				
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Not		Somewhat		Very
1. Recognizing special education student's academic strengths and weaknesses	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
2. Assessing characteristics and behavior of exceptional students in terms of programs and developmental needs	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
3. Recognizing differences and similarities of exceptional and non-exceptional students	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
4. Analyzing non-discriminatory assessment, including a sensitivity to cultural and linguistic factors	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
5. Producing and evaluating short and long-term educational objectives for regular classroom aspects of the Individualized Educational Program Goals	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
6. Using various diagnostic/prescriptive materials and procedures in reading, language and math, and perceptual motor development when appropriate	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
7. Applying diagnostic information towards the modification of traditional school curriculum and materials for selected students	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5

	1 Training		2 Experience		3 Degree of Skill				
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Not		Somewhat		Very
8. Identifying and teaching non-academic areas such as socialization skills, career and vocational education	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
9. Promoting student growth in the affective domain and in interpersonal relations	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
10. Communicating appropriate information (related to special students) to other professionals and to parents	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5
11. Understanding current special education legislation and concepts of least restrictuve environment and due process for students, parents, and teachers	Y	N	Y	N	1	2	3	4	5

7. Please add any comments or experiences related to education for handicapped students your classroom or school that you feel are important for this survey.

8. Please indicate below if you would like to participate in a personal interview with project staff to share your concerns regarding the education of handicapped learners.

_____ I am interested in a follow-up interview.
_____ I am not interested.
_____ I would prefer a telephone interview.

_______________Home Phone _______________School Phone

_______________Most Preferred Time _______________Least Preferred Time

I would prefer a personal interview _______ at home _________ at school.

You will be contacted within the next two weeks to arrange a time and place if you are interested in the follow-up interview.

9. Please indicate if you would like a copy of the results of this study. Please includ your summer address.

APPENDIX 2

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS (n=48) REPORTING SKILL LEVEL, TRAINING, AND EXPERIENCE RELATED TO 11 SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES FOR CALIFORNIA ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATION

			Degree of Skill				
			No Skill		Some Skill		Very Skilled
Competency	Training	Experience	1	2	3	4	5
1. Recognizing special education student's academic strengths and weaknesses	63	90	8	4	35	49	4
2. Assessing characteristics and behavior of exceptional students in terms of programs and developmental needs	60	86	10	14	36	34	4
3. Recognizing differences and similarities of exceptional and non-exceptional students	70	96	4	10	25	54	10
4. Analyzing non-discriminatory assessment, including a sensitivity to cultural and linguistic factors	42	63	26	14	32	23	4
5. Producing and evaluating short and long-term educational objectives for regular classroom aspects of the Individualized Educational Program Goals	51	75	21	10	34	26	9
6. Using various diagnostic/prescriptive materials and procedures in reading, language and math, and perceptual motor development when appropriate	74	88	13	6	40	29	12
7. Applying diagnostic information towards the modification of traditional school curriculum and materials for selected students	61	90	12	15	40	27	6
8. Identifying and teaching nonacademic areas such as socialization skills, career and vocational education	47	80	9	23	40	26	2
9. Promoting student growth in the affective domain and in interpersonal relations	86	96	4	10	27	58	6
10. Communicating appropriate information (related to special students) to other professionals and to parents	48	88	8	8	39	39	6
11. Understanding current special education legislation and concepts of least restrictive environment and due process for students, parents, and teachers	31	59	33	18	38	9	2

PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS (n=48) REPORTING ACTUAL AND IDEAL TIME ENGAGED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING FUNCTIONS

KEY: Never (n) Rarely (r) Occasionally (o) Frequently (f) Daily (d)

Rarely: 1-5 days per year; Occasionally: 1-2 days per month; Frequently: 1-2 days per week

Less (l) More (m) Same (s)

			TIME I ACTUALLY SPEND					TIME I SHOULD SPEND		
		ACTIVITY	n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
REFERRAL	1.	Initiate referral process	18	58	12	10	2	6	11	83
ASSESSMENT	2.	Conduct tests and assessment designed to identify special students strengths and weaknesses	19	24	29	24	4	2	24	74
	4.	Work with special educator to interpret tests and assessment information	22	33	43	2	0	2	27	71
MONITORING	9.	Monitor/evaluate progress of special education students	6	20	35	31	8	0	24	76
DUE PROCESS	19.	Participate in due process hearing	7	20	7	2	0	2	5	92
SUPERVISION	20.	Supervise peer tutors who are assigned to spec. ed. students	43	14	29	8	6	0	22	78
	21.	Supervise classroom aides or volunteers who work with special education students	26	12	6	32	24	0	8	92
PLANNING COORDINATING	3.	Write behavioral objectives to meet the needs of handicapped learners	35	35	26	4	0	4	25	71
	5.	Work with special educator to write individualized education program	44	42	12	0	0	6	28	66

continued

			n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
	6.	Design modification(s) of the regular program	31	30	30	7	2	2	20	78
	16.	Interact with other professionals (e.g. nurses, physicians, psychologists, occupational or physical therapists)	14	27	37	20	2	2	15	83
	10.	Meet with parents of special education students	18	61	18	4	0	0	27	73
	11.	Participate in IEP planning or review meeting to write or revise programs	41	43	8	8	0	2	26	72
	15.	Engage in telephone communication related to special education students	30	32	34	4	0	0	17	83
	8.	Complete forms related to serving special education students	16	57	25	0	2	4	4	92
DIRECT TEACHING	12.	Implement procedures specifically designed to discipline special education students	26	30	22	6	16	6	13	81
	13.	Intervene with non-handicapped students who are negatively interacting with handicapped students	10	34	24	26	6	0	2	98
	14.	Implement curriculum to promote positive interacting between non-handicapped & handicapped students	4	22	28	32	14	2	23	75
	17.	Provide one-to-one instruction (tutorial) for special education students	6	16	38	22	18	6	31	63
	18.	Provide small group instruction which includes the special education students.	6	6	18	32	38	0	13	87

continued

			n	r	o	f	d	l	m	s
	7.	Employ special supplementary materials or aids	18	26	24	22	10	0	25	75
INSERVICE PARTICIPATION	22.	Observe special educator implementing special education techniques	56	30	10	4	0	0	56	44
	23.	Consult with other regular teachers who work with special ed. students	20	20	38		20	4	20	76
	24.	Participate in school or district committee work for special education services	60	28	8	4	0	2	33	65
	25.	Learn to implement an educational practice which helps a special education student	20	40	30	6	4	0	45	55

TYPES AND NUMBERS OF MODIFICATIONS OF THE REGULAR PROGRAM

NO MODIFICATIONS		39%
CONSEQUENCE MODIFICATIONS		9%
Daily Progress Reports	(4%)	
Positive Reinforcement	(5%)	
CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS		31%
Adapt Assignments	(18%)	
Assign to Lower Grade	(5%)	
Special Reading System	(1%)	
Science and Art Curriculum	(7%)	
PROCESS MODIFICATIONS		55%
Cross Age Tutoring	(4%)	
Flashcard Training	(1%)	
Extra Time to Complete	(8%)	
Stay after School for Help	(2%)	
Special Educator Team-Teaches wtih Regular Class Teacher	(15%)	
Appropriate Leveling/Grouping	(19%)	
Cooperative Learning	(3%)	
Precision Teaching	(3%)	
NUMBER OF MODIFICATIONS		
None		39%
Between 1 and 2		51%
Between 3 and 5		10%

SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES AVAILABLE AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS*

SERVICE	PERCENT (n=53)
Speech/Language Therapy	96
Resource Specialist	94
Psychologist	83
Special Class for Learning Handicapped Students (LH)	75
Special Class for Communicatively Handicapped Students (CH)	30
Other (resource aide, nurse, VI consultant, Miller Unruh teacher, ESL)	17
Itinerant Consultant	15
Special Class for Severely Handicapped Students (SH)	0

*Note: Respondents accuracy ranged from 44% to 81% with an average of 56%.

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percentages of Respondents Who Reported FREQUENT and DAILY Interactions with Specified Personnel

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Special Class Teacher	67
2	Resource Specialist	52
3	Teacher Aide	51
4	Other Regular Teachers	32
5	Special Education Aide	30
6	Program Specialist	22
7	Designated Instruction	20
8	School Nurse	19
9	Principals/Vice Principal	16
10	School Psychologist	6
11	Special Education Administrator	2
12	Special Students' Parents	0

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percentages of Respondents Who Reported NEVER Interacting with Specified Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Special Education Admin.	70
2	Resource Specialist	42
3	Designated Instruction	40
4	School Nurse	32
5	School Psychologist	29
6	Principals/Vice Principal	24
7	Teacher Aide	19
7	Resource Specialist	19
8	Special Education Aide	17
9	Special Student's Parents	16
10	Other Regular Teachers	15
11	Special Class Teacher	2

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percentages of Respondents Who Reported NO SUPPORT from Specified Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Special Education Admin.	52
2	Principals/Vice Principal	48
3	Other Regular Teachers	38
3	Program Specialisthers	38
4	School Nurse	36
5	Special Student's Parents	32
6	School Psychologist	30
7	Special Education Aide	28
8	Teacher Aide	26
9	Designated Instruction	21
10	Resource Specialist	9
11	Special Class Teacher	9

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest) Percentages of Respondents Who RECEIVED SPECIAL MATERIALS AND IDEAS from Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Program Specialist	43
2	Other Regular Teachers	28
3	Resource Specialist	21
4	School Nurse	19
5	Special Class Teacher	13
5	Principals/Vice Principal	3
6	Special Education Aide	9
6	Teacher Aide	9
7	Designated Instruction	6
7	Special Student's Parents	6
8	School Psychologist	4
8	Special Education Administrator	4

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest)
Percentages of Respondents Who Reported
Person PROVIDED DIRECT INSTRUCTION TIME

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Resource Specialist	55
2	Special Education Aide	42
3	Special Class Teacher	40
3	Teacher Aide	40
4	Designated Instruction	29
5	School Psychologist	17
6	Program Specialist	15
7	Other Regular Teachers	11
7	School Nurse	11
8	Special Student's Parents	4
8	Principals/Vice Principal	4
9	Special Education Administrator	0

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest)
Percentage of Respondents Who Received
EMOTIONAL SUPPORT/STRESS REDUCTION from
Specified Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Resource Specialist	36
1	Principal/Vice Principal	36
2	School Psychologist	34
3	Other Regular Teachers	32
4	Special Student's Parents	28
5	Special Class Teacher	25
6	School Nurse	19
7	Teacher Aide	13
8	Special Education Aide	11
9	Designated Instruction	8
9	Program Specialist	8
10	Special Educ. Administrator	4

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest)
Percentage of Respondents Who RECEIVED
TRAINING IN SPECIAL TECHNIQUES from
Specified Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Resource Specialist	36
2	Special Class Teacher	8
3	School Psychologist	6
4	Program Specialist	4
5	Principals/Vice Principal	2
5	Special Student's Parents	2
-	All Others	0

Rank Order (Highest to Lowest)
Percentage of Respondents Who Reported
HIGH SATISTACTION WITH NATURE OF SUPPORT
from Specified Person

RANK	PERSON	PERCENT
1	Resource Specialist	62
2	Special Class Teacher	50
3	Special Education Aide	40
4	Teacher Aide	38
5	School Psychologist	32
5	Other Regular Teachers	32
6	Principals/Vice Principal	30
6	Special Student's Parents	30
7	Designated Instruction	27
8	School Nurse	24
9	Program Specialist	27
10	Special Educ. Administrator	8